FROM THE LIBRARY OF

REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.

BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO

THE LIBRARY OF

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SFC
9394
v.1

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 23 1937
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

FOREIGN BIBLICAL LIBRARY.

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.,

[Editor of the "Expositor."

DELITZSCH'S BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.

London:

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,

27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVII.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 23 1937
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE PSALMS.

BY

FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.,

Doctor and Professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig.

From the Latest Edition specially Revised by the Author.

IN THREE VOLUMES. VOL. I.

TRANSLATED BY THE REV. DAVID EATON, M.A.

London:

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,

27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVII.

(*All rights reserved.*)

Butler & Tanner,
The Selwood Printing Works,
Frome, and London.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THIS translation has been made from an interleaved copy of the last edition of Professor Delitzsch's Commentary with the author's latest additions and corrections in manuscript. It thus represents his present matured opinions. With the exception of pages 416–485, it has been translated by Mr. Eaton. The earlier pages of the translation have been revised by Professor Delitzsch, but from pressure of work he was not able to complete the task. To show the necessity for this new translation it will be sufficient to quote the following remarks by one of the most distinguished of living English Hebraists published lately in the *Guardian*:—

"Of Professor Delitzsch's new edition it may be fairly said that it is the most complete and trustworthy commentary on the Psalms which exists. Ten years have now elapsed since the last edition was published, and in the interval many important works have appeared, throwing new light on questions of Hebrew philology, or otherwise bearing on the interpretation of the Psalms. All these are duly noticed by Professor Delitzsch, and the results, as far as was possible or necessary, incorporated in the notes. It is the care which this veteran scholar uniformly bestows upon his successive editions that gives them their peculiar excellence. We trust that Professor Delitzsch's Commentary may long retain its well-deserved popularity."

PREFACE.

The third edition of this Commentary on the Psalms was published in the year 1873. This fourth edition contains the fruit of nine years' occasional labour and of studies specially undertaken since the winter of 1882–83 with a view to its production. Although I had not at my disposal so much free consecutive time for these studies as might have been desirable, still I believe that for my purpose I have mastered all the literature that has accumulated since 1873. In all essential respects the Commentary, it is true, is unaltered; yet there is hardly a page of the third edition that remains exactly the same in this. Whoever will take the trouble of comparing the two editions will everywhere find traces of improvement and of the endeavour to advance. Numerous contributions of a rectifying and enriching nature I owe to my beloved fellow-labourers, Dr. Eberhard Nestle, now professor in the Gymnasium at Ulm on the Danube, and to Professor Hermann Strack. In preparing this new edition, I was able to use the notes of the latter from Ps. lxxiii. onwards; for Pss. i.–lxxii., unfortunately, I could make only a partial use of them in the supplemental *Corrigenda* at the close of the work.[1]

It was my intention not to allow the Commentary to swell beyond its former size; and I have therefore as far as possible compensated for additions by means of omissions, more

[1] In this translation these *Corrigenda* are incorporated in the text.

especially by omitting the accentuological commentary to the three first Psalms (pp. 361–379 of the third edition). I have done so the more readily, as I have not learned that it has proved a welcome means of instruction to any one.

The printing of the exposition was already completed, when the substantial and learned monograph of Dr. Julius Grill (Licentiate of Theology and Ephorus in the Evangelical Theological Seminary at Maulbronn) on Ps. lxviii. appeared (Tübingen: Laupp, 1883). From the consideration and use of this work my Commentary would have gained in many respects. He regards this Psalm as the production of a poet belonging to the time when the Exile was drawing to a close. He translates *v.* 31:

Affright the beast of the reeds, the troop of bulls along with
the calves of the peoples,
With showers of silver-hail—scatter the people that delight
in war,

understanding רצי כסף to refer to the silver-white, glancing pebbles of hail; in this verse he also finds an allusion to the offensive and defensive alliance that was formed about 550 B.C. between Lydia (Crœsus), Babylon (Naboned) and Egypt (Amasis) against Cyrus, who was then aspiring to power. I still adhere, however, to the opinion that the mention of "the princes of Zebulun, the princes of Naphtali" (*v.* 28), as forming part of the triumphal procession, confines us to the time previous to the disruption of the kingdom. Grill gets rid of this historical note by taking *vv.* 25–28 as a "second retrospect," the journey of Israel from Egypt to Canaan under the guidance of its God being represented as a continuous triumphal procession.

In consequence of *v.* 31 Grätz also assigns this Psalm to a time when the domination of Egypt weighed heavily upon Judah, viz. (seeing we must overlook the transitory conquest by Shishak) the era of the 26th dynasty from Josiah on-

wards. David Kohn (דוד כהנא) in Odessa controverts him in the short treatise, אור חדש (Warsaw, 1880), in which he interprets the Psalm as referring to David's election and elevation to the kingdom; according to him *v.* 28*f.* allude to the recognition of David as king of the whole of Israel by the representatives of the tribes assembled at Hebron (1 Chron. xi. 1–3). The standpoint of the author is ultra-conservative; but nevertheless there is much to be learned from it as well as from his other writings.[1]

Professor Gustav Bickell has now issued, as the third part of his *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, the whole psalter, translated "in the measure of the original" (Insbruck, 1883). The translation is full of taste; it runs, however, monotonously in iambic or trochaic feet and in lines having the same number of syllables; *e.g.*

Preist den Herrn in der Versammlung,
Die aus Jakobs Quell ihr stammet!
Da herrscht Benjamin, der kleine;
Da sind Juda's Fürsten, Scharen;
Zebu|lon und|Naphta|li auch.[2]

Bickell's application of Syriac syllabic metres to old Hebrew poetry has found a violent opponent in Dr. Jakob Ecker,

[1] In the treatise, ספר מסרת סיג למקרא (reprinted from the Magazine השחר, Vienna, 1882), he defends the authenticity of the traditional Hebrew text. His works on Koheleth (Wilna, 1881), Esther (Warsaw, 1881), the Story of Balaam (Lemberg, 1882), and that against Eisenmenger, entitled ראש פתנים (St. Petersburg, 1883), have a similar apologetical tendency. Much may also be learned from the short Hebrew treatise, with which I have just become acquainted, by Abraham Wolfsohn, entitled צל המעלות (Warsaw, 1882), which contains marvellous conceits regarding the "hours of prayer" of the Hebrews.

[2] Praise the Lord in the assembly,
Ye that spring from Jacob's fountain!
There rules Benjamin the little,
There are Judah's princes, squadrons
Zebulun and Naphtali too.

Docent in Münster, whose reply: "*Prof. Dr. Bickell's Carmina Veteris Testamenti metrice*, the most recent monument erected in the churchyard of the Hebrew metrical system," has recently been published in an enlarged form (Münster, 1883). Nor has Bickell's discovery convinced me to the extent that, considering the respect in which I hold him as a philologist and as a master of Syriac literature, I could have wished.

As the printing of this Commentary was about completed there appeared also the new edition of the elaborate Commentary of David Kimchi on the Psalms (in the first place on Pss. i.–xli.) by Dr. S. M. Schiller-Szinessy, Cambridge,[1] who, in noble rivalry with Dr. Ad. Neubauer, Oxford, is unwearied in making old Jewish literature useful for biblical science, and in enlisting younger Christian scholars as his fellow-labourers. For this new edition he has compared 19 MSS. and the old editions.

This Commentary of mine on the Psalms has this in common with the excellent Commentary of my friend T. K. Cheyne on Isaiah (2nd edition, 1882), that it makes a modest beginning in turning Assyrian to account for the knowledge of the language of the Old Testament. I greet with joy the fresh light that is being thrown from that quarter upon biblical science; but one will not find fault with an old adherent of the school of Fleischer, if his attitude to many new Assyriological explanations of words is somewhat reserved.

In view of C. Budde's admirable discussion of the Hebrew dirge in the 2nd and 3rd years of Stade's *Zeitschrift*, I would fain have had from my old trusty fellow-labourer Wetzstein a contribution supplementing the communications made use of there; but for good reasons he excused himself from undertaking such a task. On the 3rd of June of this year he wrote me as follows: "Although I am probably familiar

[1] Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co.; Leipzig: Brockhaus.

with all forms of the lyric poetry of the Arabs, I do not venture to enter into the proposal to give an account of the technics of Arabic national song with reference to the strophe system of the Psalms. Some earlier attempts to point out in the Psalms a metrical system and a strophic structure with the same absolute certainty as is possible in Arabic have in my opinion so thoroughly failed, that I have intentionally ignored all more recent studies on that subject. In my opinion there is nothing whatever that corresponds to the Psalms in Arabic national poetry; they might find a parallel rather in a kind of poetry that is cultivated in Haurân and which has found its master in a poet with whom you are well acquainted, Ḳâsim el-Chinn of Djâsim. This kind of poetry is called Maṭlûʿ (مطلوع); it consists of four-, six-, and eight-lined rhymed strophes, which alternate with other shorter strophes, which differ from the former in respect of metre, rhyme and melody. I possess a number of such poems, but cannot make up my mind to compare them with the Psalms. Moreover such a work would not be in its proper place in your book; for seeing that only very few of your readers are thoroughly familiar with Arabic, it would require to be spun out to an unwarrantable length."

In the place of such a contribution my honoured friend furnished me with the excursus on אנוֹשׁה, Ps. lxix. 21, in a somewhat enlarged form; a second excursus, likewise meant for this Commentary, on הרים גַּבְנֻנִּים (Ps. lxviii. 17) was not completed in due time, but will appear shortly in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, and may be had from the publishers in a separate form as a supplement to this work.[1]

In view of the approaching Luther Jubilee, I close with words of Luther, referring to his second course of lectures on the Psalms, taken from his letter of 27th March, 1519, to

[1] In this translation Wetzstein's *excursus* will be found at the end of vol. iii.

the Elector, Friedrich: *Scio esse impudentissimæ temeritatis eum qui audeat profiteri, unum librum Scripturæ a se in omnibus partibus intellectum. Quin quis audeat præsumere, unum Psalmum rotunde ab ullo intellectum? Vita nostra initium et profectus est, non consummatio.*

F. D.

LEIPZIG, 1*st November*, 1883.

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

Now that my Commentary on the Psalms has been out of print for a year and a half, it may at length appear in a third edition. I owe many corrections to my friend, the Rev. Francis Bolton, whose English translations of my Psalms (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1871) and of my Job are among the most successful in Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Enlargements of several kinds were suggested by a thoroughgoing consideration of the new edition of Hupfeld's Commentary by Eduard Riehm (4 vols., 1867, 68, 70, 71); and everything else that since 1867 has been contributed towards the exposition and criticism of the Psalms by August Dillmann (review of Ewald's Commentary in vol. xiii. of the *Jahrbb. für Deutsche Theologie*), Eberhard Schrader (*Zur Text-kritik der Psalmen* in *Stud. u. Kritik.* for 1868), August Klostermann (*Untersuchungen zur alttest. Theologie*, 1868), Carl Ehrt (*Makkabäer-psalmen*, 1869), Carl Bernh. Moll (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 2 vols., 1869, 71) and others, had to be taken into account. For the comparison of the Greek versions there lay before me the volume of the new edition of the Hexapla

by Frederick Field (Oxford, 1867) containing the poetical books; the hitherto unknown Arabic version by the Karaite, Jefeth ben Eli of Basra, I was able to make use of in the edition by J. J. L. Bargès (Paris, 1871).

The list of vocables appended will show how much this third edition has been enriched in respect of etymological determinations of the meaning of terms. Many readers might perhaps have desired a reprint of the *Accentuationssystem* of the poetical books by S. Baer, contained in Vol. ii. (pp. 477–511) of the first edition (1860); for at present it is the only source from which one can derive thorough instruction regarding this difficult part of Hebrew grammar. Owing to the great expense, however, of the difficult composition, the reproduction of that comprehensive treatise would have made my Commentary too dear; and, moreover, the publishers have still a few copies of that second volume, so that the treatise, the place of which is not yet taken by anything else, has not entirely vanished from the book market. Its place will be taken in the present edition by an accentuological commentary on Pss. i.–iii.

The Hebrew Psalter of S. Baer, published, with a preface by me, in 1861, by Dörffling and Franke, contains a short outline of the poetical system of accentuation.[1] In the meantime also the wish expressed by me, that a Hebrew edition of the Psalms with the Latin version of Jerome from the original—a version which has not become an integral portion of the Vulgate—might be published, has been fulfilled. The critical revision of the text of this Latin version was the last labour of my friend, von Tischendorf, who has ever since been grievously afflicted with sickness. The new Psalter, which is equipped with a large number of Masoretic supplements and of others referring to the history of the text, has

[1] The place of this critical edition of the Psalms, which has been long out of print, is now taken by the much better got up edition of Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1880.

the title: ספר תהלות *Liber Psalmorum Hebraicus atque Latinus ab Hieronymo ex Hebræo conversus. Consociata opera ediderunt Constantinus de* Tischendorf, S. Baer, Fr. Delitzsch. *Lipsiæ: F. A. Brockhaus.* 1873.

F. D.

Leipzig, 19*th Sept.*, 1873.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

Since the publication of my Commentary on the Psalter (2 vols. 1859–60), seven full years have passed, during which many important contributions have been made towards the exposition of the Psalms. Of Hupfeld's Commentary the two last volumes (vol. iii. 1860, vol. iv. 1862) have been published since the completion of mine; that of Hitzig (1835–36) has appeared in a new form (2 vols. 1863–65), enriched by the fruit of well-nigh thirty years' continuous labour; and Ewald's has also taken the field for the third time (1866), striking down all fellow-labourers with proud words, in order to ascribe honour to itself alone. Besides these, Böttcher's *Neue Kritische Ährenlese*, issued by Mühlau since the author's death, has furnished valuable contributions towards the exposition of the Psalms (*Abth.* 2, 1864); Von Ortenberg has furthered the comprehension of the Psalms as regards textual criticism (*Zur Textkritik der Ps.*, 1861), and Kurtz as regards their theology (*Zur Theologie der Ps.* in the Dorpat *Zeitschrift*, 1864–65); and in addition to these, Böhl's *Zwölf Messianische Psalmen* (1864), and Kamphausen's exposition of the Psalms in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (1863), ought also to be taken notice of.

I was therefore not without external inducements to re-

vise my own Commentary ; and I was also well aware of its defects. Still, Hupfeld's inconsiderately condemnatory judgment grieved me. In an article on the faithful representation of the text of the Old Testament according to the Masora (*Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1863), I gave incidental expression to this feeling. On the 20th of October, 1863, Hupfeld wrote me:—"I have but just seen your complaint regarding my judgment at the close of my work on the Psalms. The complaint is so gentle, it answers so little to the harshness of my judgment and at the same time strikes chords that are not yet deadened within me, and which have not yet forgotten how to bring back the echo of happier days of common research and to revive the feeling of gratitude for true fellowship, that it has touched my heart and conscience." He closes his letter with the hope that he might still have an opportunity of stating publicly how very repugnant that harsh and untempered judgment was to his own present feelings. Up till now I have made no use whatever of this letter. I regarded it as a secret between us two. Now, however, that Riehm has transferred that judgment unaltered to the second edition of the first volume of Hupfeld's Commentary, I owe it not only to myself, but also to him who has since departed this life, to explain that this has not been done in accordance with his mind.

Hitzig's new Commentary has been of the greatest service to me in preparing this new edition of mine. Here I found mine, with or without being mentioned, taken uniformly into account from beginning to end, and subjected to a keen but kindly criticism, occasionally not without a frank recognition of the scientific advance that cannot but be observed in it. In comparison with such a severe judgment as that which Hupfeld pronounced upon me, and which Ewald a few years later passed upon him in similar language, I here met with a reasonable criticism of the matter, and, notwithstanding the full self-consciousness of the thoroughly original in-

vestigator, also an appreciation of the arduous labour of others.

So much the more may I hope that all those who do not regard scientific appreciation of truth and progress as the exclusive prerogative of their own school, will find in this new edition of my Commentary much that is instructive, and also much that is more correctly apprehended. Readers will thank me for having continued to turn the rich oriental learning of Fleischer and Wetzstein into the channel of biblical science. That I also delight in drawing contributions from Jewish investigators within my reach, is owing to my desire to see the partition wall between Synagogue and Church broken down. The exposition of Scripture has not only to serve the Church of the present, but has also to assist in building up the Church of the future. In this spirit I commend the present work to the grace and blessing of the God of the history of redemption.

Erlangen, *7th July*, 1867.

F. D.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PSALTER.

"What the heart is in man, that the Psalter is in the Bible."—JOH. ARND.

INTRODUCTION.

I. Position of the Psalter among the Hagiographa, and more especially among the Poetical Books.

The Psalter everywhere forms an integral portion of the so-called *Kethubim* or *Hagiographa*. Its position among these, however, is somewhat variable. It seems to follow from Luke xxiv. 44, that in pre-Talmudic times it opened that division of the Canon.[1] In the Hebrew MSS. of the German class the prevalent sequence of the books is really as follows: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, then the five Megilloth; and this order has been followed in our common printed editions. The Masora, however, and the MSS. of the Spanish class begin the *Kethubim* with Chronicles, which they unskilfully separate from Ezra-Nehemiah, and then make the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, and the five Megilloth follow.[2] And according to the Talmud (*Bathra*, 14 *b*) the

[1] This seems to follow also from 2 Macc. ii. 13, where *τὰ τοῦ Δαυὶδ* appears to be a designation given to the כתובים from their commencement; and we may also draw the same conclusion from Philo, *de vita contempl.* (*Opp.*, ii. 475, *ed. Mangey*), where he distinguishes between *νόμους καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οἷς ἐπιστήμη καὶ εὐσέβεια συναύξονται καὶ τελειοῦνται.*

[2] In all the Masoretic lists the twenty-four books succeed one another in the following order: (1) בראשית; (2) ואלה שמות; (3) ויקרא; (4) וידבר (also במדבר); (5) אלה הדברים; (6) יהושע; (7) שופטים; (8) שמואל; (9) מלכים; (10) ישעיה; (11) ירמיה; (12) יחזקאל; (13) תרי עשר; (14) דברי הימים; (15 תהלות; (16) איוב; (17) משלי;

right sequence is as follows: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs; the Book of Ruth precedes the Psalter as being its prologue, for Ruth is the ancestress of him to whom the sacred lyric owes the era of its richest efflorescence.

That the Psalter should open the division of the *Kethubim* is undoubtedly the most natural arrangement, if for no other reason than this, that in its nucleus it represents the time of David, just as Proverbs and Job represent the Chokma-literature of the time of Solomon. It is self-evident, however, that it is only among the *Kethubim* that it could find its proper place. The first place in the Canon is taken by the codex of the giving of the law. This codex is the foundation of the Old Covenant and of Israel's nationality as well as of all its subsequent literature;—it is the תורה, in contradistinction to which all the other sacred writings are reckoned קבלה (tradition resting on it).[1] This fundamental five-fold book is followed by two series of historical writings, to which there is given the collective title נביאים. The first of these two series consists of writings of a prophetical character that relate to the past, and bring down the history of Israel from the occupation of Canaan to the first dawning of light in the penal condition of the Babylonian exile (*Prophetæ priores*). The second series relates to the future; it consists of predictive writings composed by prophetical authors, which reach down to the time of Darius Nothus, and indeed to Nehemiah's second stay in Jerusalem during the reign of that Persian monarch (*Prophetæ posteriores*). Regarded chronologically, the first series would correspond better with the second, if the historical books of the Persian period (Chronicles-Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther)

(18) רות; (19) שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים; (20) קהלת; (21) קינות (איכה); (22) אחשורוש (מגלה); (23) דניאל; (24) עזרא. The Masoretic abbreviation for the three specially poetical books is accordingly not א"מת, but ת"אם; *vid.* Elia Levita, *Masoreth ha-Masoreth*, p. 19, 73 (*ed. Ven.* 1538).

[1] The Psalms are so cited, *e.g.* in *Sifrê* on Num. xv. 30.

had been joined to it; but for a good reason this was not done. The literature of Israel has struck out two sharply distinguished methods of writing history, viz. the annalistic and the prophetic, as types of which we may regard the Elohistic and Jehovistic methods in the Pentateuch and in Joshua. Now those historical books of the Persian period are annalistic, and not prophetic, in their character (although the Books of Chronicles have taken up and embodied many remnants of the prophetic method of writing history, just as, conversely, the Books of Kings have done with many remnants that are annalistic); they could not therefore be placed among the *Prophetæ priores*. Only with Ruth the case is different. This short book bears such a close resemblance to the end of the Book of Judges (chaps. xvii.–xxi.) that it might very well stand between it and Samuel. Its original position was behind the Book of Judges, just as the Lamentations of Jeremiah stood after the book of his prophecies; and it is only for liturgical reasons that both these books have been placed among the so-called Megilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther,—the order in which they follow one another in our ordinary printed editions, according to the calendar of the festivals). It is self-evident that all the remaining books could be embraced only in the third division of the Canon, which (as could hardly have been otherwise in addition to תורה and נביאים) received the general title of כתובים; a title which, as the grandson of Ben-Sira renders it in his prologue (B.C. 132), signifies τὰ ἄλλα πάτρια βιβλία. This name is given to writings, and that too sacred writings (γραφεῖα or ἁγιόγραφα, to use an expression current in the time of Epiphanius), upon which one can take one's stand, and to which one can appeal with ככתוב or דכתיב (γέγραπται γάρ).[1] Accordingly, although this title has not the same meaning, it has the same value as

[1] *Vid.* my Hebrew *Epistle to the Romans* (1870), p. 12.

כתבי קדש; but it would be a mistake to regard it as equivalent to כתובים ברוח הקדש; for the doctrine of three degrees of inspiration, according to which ברוח הקדש is the third degree, that, viz. which is associated with the greatest independent mental activity of the writer, cannot be traced further back than Maimonides (*d.* 1204).

II. Names of the Psalter.

At the close of Psalm lxxii. we find (*v.* 20) the subscription: "*the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.*" Here the whole of the preceding Psalms are comprehended under the name תְּפִלּוֹת. This is surprising, for, with the exception of Ps. xvii. (and further on lxxxvi., xc., cii., cxlii.), they are all otherwise entitled, and many, *e.g.* Pss. i. and ii., contain no invocation of God, and therefore do not have the form of prayers. Nevertheless the collective name תפלות is suitable to all the Psalms. The essential element in prayer is the direct and undiverted turning of the soul to God, the absorption of the spirit in thoughts of Him. All the Psalms participate in this, the essential element in prayer—even those that are didactic, and such hymns as Hannah's song of praise, which is introduced in 1 Sam. ii. 1 with ותתפלל.

The external title borne by the Psalter is תְּהִלִּים (סֵפֶר), for which תִּלִּים (apocopated תִּלֵּי) is also commonly used, as Hippolytus (*ed. de Lagarde*, p. 188) testifies: Ἑβραῖοι περιέγραψαν τὴν βίβλον Σέφρα Θελείμ.[1] This name also may surprise us; for the greater number of the Psalms are hardly hymns in the proper sense; most of them are elegiac or didactic, and only one (Ps. cxlv.) is directly entitled תהלה. But this col-

[1] In Eusebius, vi. 25: Σέφηρ Θιλλήν; Jerome (preface to his translation of the Psalms *juxta Hebraicam veritatem*) vocalises it still differently: SEPHAR THALLIM *quod interpretatur volumen hymnorum.* Accordingly at the end of the *Psalterium ex Hebræo*, *Cod.* 19 of the Convent Library of St. Gall, we find the subscription: *Sephar Tallim Quod interpretatur volumen Ymnorum explicit.*

lective name of the Psalms is also admissible; for they all participate in the essential nature of the hymn, viz. in that which is its real object, the glorifying of God. Those that are narrative praise the *magnalia Dei;* those that are plaintive praise Him likewise, inasmuch as they turn to Him as the sole helper, and close with the grateful assurance that they will be heard; and the verb הִלֵּל includes both: the *magnificat* and the *de profundis*. Instead of the dissimilate plural, תהלים (if we may coin such a technical term), the language of the Masora prefers the most natural plural form of the noun, and throughout calls the Psalter סִפְרַ תְּהִלּוֹת (*e.g.* on 2 Sam. xxii. 5).[1]

In Syriac the Psalter is called *K*e*thobo d*e*mazmûre*, in the Koran *zabûr* (not *zubûr*, as Golius and Freytag vocalize it), a word which in Arabic signifies nothing more than "writing" (synon. *kitâb; vid.* on iii. 1), but which is perhaps a corruption of *mizmor*, from which a plural, *mezâmîr*, which is found in Jewish-Oriental MSS., is formed by a change of vowels. A plural of *mizmor* does not occur in the Old Testament. Even in the post-biblical *usus loquendi* it is but seldom that either *mizmorim* or *mizmoroth* occurs as a name of the Psalms. In Hellenistic Greek the corresponding Ψαλμοί (from ψάλλειν = זָמַר) is so much the more common; the collection of the Psalms is called *βίβλος ψαλμῶν* (Luke xx. 42; Acts i. 20) or *ψαλτήριον*, the name of the stringed instrument (*psantērîn* in the Book of Daniel)[2] being metaphorically transferred to

[1] It is an erroneous opinion of Buxtorf, in his *Tiberias*, and also of Jewish Masoretes, that the Masora calls the Psalter הלילא (*hallêla*). Only the so-called *Hallel* (Ps. cxiii.–cxviii.) bears this name; for in the Masora to 2 Sam. xxii. 5, Ps. cxvi. 3 *a* is called, in relation to xviii. 5 *a*, חברו דהלילא (the similar passage in the Hallel).

[2] Νάβλα—so say Eusebius and others of the Greek Fathers—παρ' Ἑβραίοις λέγεται τὸ ψαλτήριον, ὃ δὴ μόνον τῶν μουσικῶν ὀργάνων ὀρθότατον καὶ μὴ συνεργούμενον εἰς ἦχον ἐκ τῶν κατωτάτω μερῶν, ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν ἔχον τὸν ὑπηχοῦντα χαλκόν (*i.e.* the brazen sounding-board, the χάλκωμα). Augustine, *in Ps.* xlii. and elsewhere, describes this instrument still

the hymns sung to its accompaniment. Psalms are songs for the lyre, and therefore lyric poems in the strictest sense.

III. The History of Psalm Composition.

Before we now attempt to form a clear idea of the origin of the Psalter, we must take a general survey of the course of development through which psalmody has passed. Lyric poetry is the earliest kind of poetry in general, and Hebrew poetry is consequently essentially lyrical. Neither the epos nor the drama has branched off from it so as to attain to independence; the *Maschal* alone has done so. Even prophecy, which is distinguished from psalmody by the circumstance that in it the mind of the writer is more prevailingly sustained by the power of the Divine Spirit, shares with the latter the common designation of נְבִיא (1 Chron. xxv. 1–3), and the Psalm-singer, מְשׁוֹרֵר, is even as such called חוֹזֶה (1

more clearly: *Psalterium istud organum dicitur quod de superiore parte habet testudinem, illud scilicet tympanum et concavum lignum cui chordæ innitentes resonant, cithara vero id ipsum lignum cavum et sonorum ex inferiore parte habet.* We must not, however, understand this in accordance with the construction of that which we now call harp and cithern; as J. Akermark (1874) has shown, the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments give the correct representation. The sound-board of the כִּנּוֹר is below; if we conceive the instrument to be held perpendicularly, it forms its lower part, from which the strings proceed; these are left free, and are gathered together above by means of a crosspiece. The נֵבֶל, on the other hand, has the resounding body above, where it protects the strings like a *testudo*. That, however, which is common to the נֵבֶל, in all its forms, as distinguished from the כִּנּוֹר, is that its strings, like that of a bow, have no external covering. Accordingly the כִּנּוֹר is the cithern as well as the lyre, the נֵבֶל being the harp, as Basil says: *τοῦτο (ψαλτήριον) μόνον τῶν μουσικῶν ὀργάνων τὴν αἰτίαν τῶν φθόγγων ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν ἔχει. τῇ κιθάρᾳ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τῇ λύρᾳ κάτωθεν ὁ χαλκὸς ὑπηχεῖ πρὸς τὸ πλῆκτρον· ψαλτήριον δὲ τοῦτο τῶν ἁρμονικῶν ῥυθμῶν ἄνωθεν ἔχει τὰς ἀφορμάς.* *Vid.* Riehm, Art. *Musik* in his *Handwörterbuch*, p. 1031. It is worthy of notice that the sacred Scriptures nowhere make mention of a plectrum, although this instrument is found both on the Egyptian and the Assyrian monuments.

Chron. xxv. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 30; xxxv. 15; cf. 1 Chron. xv. 19, and freq.); for just as the sacred lyric often rises into prophetic vision, so the prophetic epic of the future, not being emancipated from the subjectivity of the seer, frequently passes over into the strain of the Psalm.

The Mosaic era was the birth-time not only of Israel as a people, but also of its national lyric. From Egypt the Israelites brought instruments with them, which accompanied their first song (Exod. xv.)—their earliest hymn, which re-echoes through all the hymns of the following period, and even through the whole of the Psalter (cf. *v.* 2 with Ps. cxviii. 14; *v.* 3 with Ps. xxiv. 8; *v.* 4, xiv. 27 with Ps. cxxxvi. 15; *v.* 8 with Ps. lxxviii. 13; *v.* 11 with Ps. lxxvii. 14, lxxxvi. 8, lxxxix. 7*f.*; *vv.* 13, 17 with Ps. lxxviii. 54, and other parallels of a similar kind). If to this first hymn of theirs we add Ps. xc. and Deut. xxxii., we have here the prototypes of all the various kinds of Psalms, the hymnic, the elegiac, and the prophetico-didactic. These three hymns are still wanting in the later art of strophic symmetry. But Deborah's song of victory, a song that is arranged in hexastichs, already shows us the strophic art near its perfection. It has been thought strange that the beginnings of poetry in Israel should be already so perfect; but the history, not only of Israel, but also of its literature, stands under another law than that of a constant development from below upwards. The unique redemptive era of Moses dominates, as a creative beginning, the whole of the subsequent development. No doubt there is a constant progress, but it is only such as gradually to develop that which had commenced in the time of Moses with all the primal force and fulness of a divine creation. How closely, however, the several stages of this development are linked together, is apparent from the fact that Hannah, the singer of the Old Testament *magnificat*, bore under her heart him who anointed the "sweet singer of Israel" to be king.

It was by means of David that the sacred lyric attained its richest efflorescence. Many causes contributed to make the time of David its golden age. Samuel prepared the way, not only by his reforming activity in general, but also more especially by founding schools of the prophets, in which, under his supervision (1 Sam. xix. 19 *f.*), song and music were cultivated, along with the awakening and fostering of the gift of prophecy. Through these *cœnobia*, from which there proceeded such a spiritual awakening as had not hitherto been experienced in Israel, David also passed. Here his poetic genius, if not awakened, was at least cultivated. He was a born musician and poet; and in his case there was combined with these natural endowments a heart full of deep piety. Even when a shepherd in Bethlehem he had cultivated music. But the Psalter no more contains Psalms of his belonging to this period (*vid.* on Pss. viii. and cxliv.) than the New Testament contains writings of the Apostles composed before the day of Pentecost. Not until, upon the occasion of his being anointed king of Israel, the Spirit of Jahve came upon him, and raised him to the height of his sacred calling, did he sing Psalms, which have become integral portions of the Canon. They are the fruit, not only of his personality, which was richly endowed and sustained by the Spirit of God (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), but also of his peculiar experiences, and of those of his people that were interwoven with his. From the time of his anointing, David's path led through suffering to glory; song, however, as an Indian proverb says, has sprung from suffering, *çlôka* from *çôka*. His life was rich in vicissitudes, which must have tuned him, now to elegiac plaints, now to hymnic strains of praise; the founder of the kingdom of promise, he was at the same time a prophecy of the coming Christ; his typically moulded life could not otherwise utter itself than in words that were typical or even consciously prophetic. When he reached the throne, he did not forget the harp, which had

accompanied and consoled him as he fled from Saul, but rewarded it according to its deserts. He appointed four thousand Levites, the fourth division of the whole Levitical order, to officiate as singers and players in connection with the worship of God in the tent temple on Zion, and partly also in Gibeon, the place of the Mosaic tabernacle. These he divided into twenty-four classes under the chief musicians, Asaph, Heman, and Ethan (=Jeduthun; 1 Chron. xxv.; cf. xv. 17 *ff.*); and by means of his own invention he also increased the number of the musical instruments (1 Chron. xxiii. 5; Neh. xii. 36).[1] In the time of David there were three places where sacrifices might be offered: on Zion, beside the ark of the covenant (2 Sam. vi. 17 *f.*); in Gibeon, beside the Mosaic tabernacle (1 Chron. xvi. 39 *f*); and later, on the threshing-floor of Ornan, afterwards the temple-hill (1 Chron. xxi. 28–30). Thus others also were encouraged in many ways to consecrate their gifts to the God of Israel. In addition to the seventy-three Psalms which are entitled לדוד, the direct Davidic authorship of which is attested, not indeed in the case of them all, but certainly in the case of many,[2] by their creative originality, their impassioned and predominantly elegiac strain, their graceful flow and movement, their language, antique yet clear, and becoming obscure and harsh only when describing the dissolute career of the ungodly—in addition to these seventy-three the collection

[1] In the Greek Psalm, which is placed after Ps. cl., David says: I tended my father's sheep, my hands made pipes (ὄργανον = עוּגָב), and my fingers put together (or, tuned) harps (ψαλτήριον = נֵבֶל). Cf. *Wajikra Rabba*, c. 15 (*f.* 264 *a*), and the Targum to Amos vi. 5.

[2] Schultz, in his *Alttest. Theologie* (second edition, 1878), acknowledges at least ten Psalms as Davidic. The consequences which follow for the reconstruction of the history of the religion of Israel from the recognition, whether it be of ten or more genuine Davidic Psalms, are so important, that the endeavour of some recent writers to bring down all the Psalms to the time after the Exile, is comprehensible as an attempt to paralyse these consequences.

contains the following, which are named after contemporary singers who were appointed by David: twelve לאסף (Pss. l., lxxiii.–lxxxiii), the purport and spirit of which are predominantly prophetical, and twelve by the Levitical family of singers, the בני־קרח (Pss. xlii.–xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii., including Ps. xliii.), of a predominantly kingly and priestly character. The two Psalms of the Ezrahites, Ps. lxxxviii. by Heman, and Ps. lxxxix. by Ethan, belong to the time of Solomon, whose name is borne only by Pss. lxxii. and cxxvii. Under Solomon psalmody already began to decline; all the productions of the mind of that period bear the stamp of thoughtful contemplation rather than of direct feeling, for restless yearning after higher things had given place to sensuous enjoyment, national concentration to cosmopolitan expansion. It was the age of the Chokma, which gave to the apophthegm its perfect artistic form, and also produced a species of drama. Solomon himself helped to bring the Maschal, the form of poetical composition that was characteristic of the Chokma, to its perfection. It is true that according to 1 Kings v. 12, he was also the author of a thousand and five songs; but of his compositions the Canon contains only two Psalms and the dramatic Song of Songs; and the reason is to be found in the fact that he spoke of trees, from the cedar to the hyssop—his poems were mostly of a worldly purport, they referred to the kingdom of nature rather than to the kingdom of grace.

Only twice after this did psalmody enjoy a brief period of revival; viz. under Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah. Under both these kings the beautiful services of the temple arose, in all the fulness of their old splendour, from the desecration and decay into which they had fallen. There were, moreover, two great marvellous deliverances, which revived Psalm-poetry during the reign of both these monarchs: in the time of Jehoshaphat, the overthrow of the neighbouring nations that had combined to extirpate Judah, an overthrow

that was predicted by Jahaziel, the Asaphite; in the time of Hezekiah, the overthrow of Sennacherib's host, which Isaiah had foretold. In other ways also both these kings rendered great service to the cause of culture; Jehoshaphat by means of an organization that aimed at the raising of the national intelligence, and which reminds us of the Carlovingian *missi* (2 Chron. xvii. 7–9); Hezekiah, whom we may regard as the Pisistratus of Israelitish literature, by the appointment of a commission charged with the duty of collecting the remains of the early literature (Prov. xxv. 1); he also revived the ancient sacred music, and restored the Psalms of David and of Asaph to their liturgical use (2 Chron. xxix. 25 *ff*). And, as his מכתב (מכתם?) shows (Isa. xxxviii.), he himself was also a poet, though much more reproductive than productive. From the time of Jehoshaphat as well as from that of Hezekiah we have in the Psalter not a few Psalms, mostly Asaphic and Korahitic, which, although they have no historical titles, plainly reveal themselves as belonging to these times.[1] Apart from these two periods of revival, the time of the later kings is almost destitute of sacred poets; but it is all the richer in prophets. When the lyre became mute, prophecy raised its trumpet voice, in order to revive the religious life, which was wont to express itself in Psalms. It is no doubt true that, in the writings of the prophets, which represent the λεῖμμα χάριτος in Israel, we also find such Psalms as Jonah ch. ii., Isa. ch. xii., and Hab. ch. iii.; but even these are imitations of the old congregational hymns rather than original productions. Not until after the Exile do we find a time of new creations.

Just as the Reformation gave birth to German hymnology, and the Thirty Years' War (without which there would per-

[1] As regards the time of Jehoshaphat, Nic. Nonne has already acknowledged this in his *Diss. de Tzippor et Deror* (Bremen, 1741, 4to), which has reference to Ps. lxxxiv. 4.

haps have been no Paul Gerhardt) called it anew into life, so the time of David gave birth to psalmody, and the Exile awoke it from the dormant condition into which it had fallen. The divine chastisement was not without its intended effect. There are Psalms belonging to the time of the Exile (*e.g.* Ps. cii); and many older Psalms have additions, from which we can easily discern how frequently they were used as prayers in these disastrous days. Far more new Psalms, however, were composed after the Return. When the exiles who came back to their native land (and among these were many Asaphites)[1] felt themselves to be once more a nation, and, after the restoration of the temple, even a Church, the harps, which in Babylon had been hung upon the willows, were tuned afresh, and a new rich blessing of song was the fruit of the reawakening of their first love. This love, it is true, did not endure for any very lengthened period. A service of God consisting in ceremonies and in the worship of the letter took the place of the gross external idolatry, from which the returned exiles had been weaned by the chastisement they had undergone in a foreign land. Nevertheless, in the period of the Seleucidæ the oppressed and violated national feeling awoke under the Maccabees in all the living enthusiasm of early days. Prophecy, as is often bewailed in the first Book of Maccabees, had at that time been long silent. It is so much the more natural to assume, that Psalm-poetry revived. At the time of the Reformation, Calvin declared Pss. xliv., lxxiv., and lxxix. to be Maccabæan; and Esrom Rudinger assigned other twenty-two to the same period. With much erudition and ingenuity Hitzig has attempted to give positive proof, that it is Maccabee Psalms that form the real nucleus of the Psalter; he recognises the Maccabee prince, Alexander Jannæus, as the

[1] In Barhebræus on Job, and in his *Chronikon*, many traditions are traced back to "Asaph, the Hebrew priest, the brother of Ezra the scribe."

author of Pss. i. and ii., and makes Ps. xliv. refer to 1 Macc. v. 56–62; he further maintains, not only in his Commentary on the Psalms, published in 1835–36, but also in his more recent work, published in 1863–65, that from Ps. lxxiii. onwards there is not a single pre-Maccabee Psalm to be found in the whole collection, and that from that Psalm to its close the Psalter reflects the prominent events of the Maccabee period in their chronological order. Von Lengerke and Olshausen have substantially followed Hitzig. They both assign the composition of the latest Psalms and the compilation of the Psalter as we now possess it to the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–107); whereas Hitzig, coming somewhat further down, ascribes Pss. i., ii., cl., as well as others, and the arrangement of the whole, to Alexander Jannæus, the son of Hyrcanus. On the other hand, the existence of Maccabee Psalms has been disputed, not only by Hengstenberg, Hävernick and Keil, but also by Gesenius, Hassler, Ewald, Thenius, Böttcher, Hupfeld, Dillmann, and, most thoroughly of all, by Ehrt in his monograph: *Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters zur Prüfung der Frage nach Makkabäerpsalmen* (1869). We for our part admit at least the possibility of such Psalms. It has been said that the grand inspiring idea of the Maccabee period was human rather than divine, patriotic in a popular sense rather than national in a theocratic sense; but the Book of Daniel shows us, in a prophetical representation of that period, a holy people of the Highest, contending against the godless world-power, and claims for these contests the greatest significance in connection with the history of redemption. Nor does the history of the Canon preclude the possibility of Maccabee Psalms. For although the Chronicler, when combining into a mosaic reminiscences of the Psalms taken from the first book to the fifth (1 Chron. xvi.), entitles us, by means of *v.* 36, to come to the sure conclusion, that in his day the Psalter (cf. τὰ τοῦ Δαυίδ, 2 Macc.

ii. 13)[1] was already a whole, divided into five books (*vid.* on Pss. xcvi., cv., cvi.); yet even after its redaction was complete, it might remain open for later interpolations (just as the ספר הישר, which is quoted in the Book of Joshua and in 2 Sam. i., was a compilation that had grown gradually in the course of time). When Judas Maccabæus walked in the footsteps of Nehemiah in this respect, that he collected the national literature (2 Macc. ii. 14: *ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας τὰ διεσκορπισμένα διὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν γεγονότα ἡμῖν ἐπισυνήγαγε πάντα, καὶ ἔστι παρ' ἡμῖν*), it is natural to suppose that at that time the Psalter was also enriched. Although the period of the Maccabees produced no prophet, we may nevertheless assume that many of them possessed the gift of poetry, and that the spirit of faith, which is essentially one and the same with the spirit of prophecy, could consecrate and fructify this gift. We have an actual proof of this in the so-called Salomonic Psalter.[2] It consists of eighteen Psalms; and though these are far inferior to our canonical Psalms, both in respect of originality and artistic beauty (more especially in our present Greek translation of the original Heb. text), they are nevertheless an evidence that, even during the period of the Maccabees, the feelings of the faithful still poured themselves forth in spiritual songs. And if the Book of Daniel in its present form belongs to the time of the Seleucidæ (and its prophetical character remains secured to it, if it was issued before the reconsecration of the temple in December, 165, and before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes

[1] In both the Eastern and Western early Churches the Psalter is directly called *David*, *e.g.* in Chrysostom: *ἐκμαθόντες ὅλον τὸν Δαβίδ*, and at the end of the Æthiopic Psalter: "Dâvîd is ended."

[2] This was first made known by de la Cerda in his *Adversaria sacra* (1626), and afterwards received by Fabricius into his *Codex Pseudepigraphus V.T.*, p. 914 ff (1713). It has recently been edited in a separate form and annotated by Eduard Ephraem Geiger (Augsburg, 1871), who adopts the opinion that is now prevalent, and assigns it to the time of Pompey.

in the year 164), we may argue from the history of the Canon in favour of, rather than against, the existence of Maccabee Psalms. Grätz assigns a still later date to the completion of this division of the Canon. He does so, however, in consequence of his drawing an erroneous conclusion from *Jadajim*, iii. 5, iv. 6 (cf. *Edijoth*, v. 3), according to which doubts were expressed in Jerusalem about 65 A.D. and in Jamnia about 90 A.D. as to Ecclesiastes and Canticles being equally holy with the other sacred writings (כתבי קדשׁ). But the question discussed then was not whether these two books were to be received into the Canon, but whether they had rightly been received into it. A doubt of the same kind was raised in regard to Ezekiel (*Schabbath*, 13 *b*). The testimony of Josephus in his Apology for the Jewish nation against the Alexandrian *litterateur* Apion (i. § 8; cf. *Ant.*, x. 2, 2) shows that, when he issued that book (about 100 A.D.), the sacred Scriptures had already for centuries formed a whole consisting of twenty and a few more books, and that the Psalter, which he describes as ὕμνους εἰς Θεόν, was one of these. As we may infer from Luke xxiv. 44, the Psalter stood at the head of the Hagiographa. The period of the Maccabees is the latest time to which any Psalm in the collection may be assigned. And since the Maccabee movement, although beginning in the spirit, nevertheless ran its course in the flesh, we cannot at least expect to find any Psalm referring to it, the date of which is later than the time of Judas Maccabæus. And from all that we know of the character and reign of Alexander Jannæus, it is morally impossible that that despot should have been the author of the first and second Psalms and the final editor of the whole collection.

IV. Origin of the Collection of the Psalms.

The Psalter as we now possess it consists of five books.[1] Τοῦτό σε μὴ παρέλθοι, ὦ φιλόκαλε—says Hippolytus, whose words are afterwards repeated by Epiphanius—ὅτι καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον εἰς πέντε διεῖλον βιβλία οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, ὥστε εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸ ἄλλην πεντάτευχον. This agrees with the Midrasch on i. 1: Moses gave the Israelites the five books of the Thôra, and corresponding to these (כנגדם) David gave them the Book of Psalms, which consists of five books (ספר תהלים שיש בו המשה ספרים). The hypothesis of de Lagarde,[2] that "the five divisions were meant for five different portions of public worship," breaks down when we attempt to carry it out. It is a sufficient explanation of this division into five parts, that it makes the Psalter the copy and echo of the Thôra. It also resembles the latter in this respect, that, as in the Thôra Elohistic and Jehovistic sections alternate, so here a group of Elohim Psalms (xlii.–lxxxiv.) is surrounded on both sides by groups that are Jehovistic (i.–xli., lxxxv.–cl.). The five books are as follows: i.–xli., xlii.–lxxii., lxxiii.–lxxxix., xc.–cvi., cvii.–cl.[3] Each of the first four books concludes with a doxology, which it would be a mistake to regard as an integral portion of the preceding Psalm (xli. 14; lxxii. 18 *f.*; lxxxix. 53; cvi. 48), and the place of the fifth doxology is taken by Ps. cl. as a full-toned finale to the whole (similar to the relation of Ps. cxxxiv. to the so-called Songs of Degrees). These doxologies already approximate to the language of the liturgical *Beracha* of the second temple. Nowhere in the Old Testament save in them do we

[1] The Karaite Jerocham (about 950) says מגלות (rolls) instead of ספרים.

[2] *Orientalia, zweites Heft* (1880), p. 13 *ff.*, where, in connection with that hypothesis, it is assumed that the so-called *Lamed auctoris* assigns the Psalm to the kind of temple music thereby named; even לדוד means a division of the temple choir that was named after David.

[3] The Karaite Jefeth ben Eli calls them ספר אישרי, ס׳ כאיל, etc.

find אָמֵן וְאָמֵן coupled with ו (cf., on the other hand, Num. v. 22, and also Neh. viii. 6). Even so early as the time of the Chronicler, the Psalter was a whole divided into five parts, with the divisions indicated by these marks. We infer this from 1 Chron. xvi. 36. In the free manner of a speech in Thucydides or Livy, the Chronicler there reproduces the Davidic festal strains that resounded on the occasion of the bringing back of the ark; but he does so in such a way, that, after he has once fallen into Psalm reminiscences taken from Psalm cvi., he even puts into David's mouth the *Beracha* that we find at the end of that Psalm. We perceive from this that the Psalter was already divided into books; the closing doxologies had already been thoroughly incorporated with the Psalms behind which they stood. The Chronicler, however, wrote during the pontificate of Johanan, the son of Eliashib, the predecessor of Jaddua, towards the end of the Persian supremacy, but still a considerable time before the beginning of that of the Greeks.

Next to this application of the *Beracha* of the fourth book by the Chronicler, Ps. lxxii. 20 throws most light on the history of the origin of the Psalter. These words: "*the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended*," are undoubtedly the subscription of the oldest collection of Psalms that preceded our present Psalm-pentateuch. It is true that, by the interpolation of the *Beracha* (lxxii. 18 *f.*), the redactor has removed this subscription from its original place immediately after lxxii. 17; but he has left it otherwise untouched. In this respect the redactors and editors of earlier sources that are incorporated within the literature of the Bible show themselves exceedingly conscientious; they thereby also make it much easier for us to obtain a glimpse into the origin of their works. The redactor of the Books of Samuel, *e.g.*, gives intact the list of officials (2 Sam. viii. 16–18) which he found in a later historical source (and with which it ended,

so far at least as we know it from the extracts preserved to us), as well as the list that he found in an older document (2 Sam. xx. 23–26); and not only the author of the Books of Kings, who flourished about the middle of the Exile, but even the Chronicler, who lived towards the close of the Persian period, have adopted unaltered the statement, which they found in an annalistic source, that the staves of the ark are to be found in the rings of it "to this day" (1 Kings viii. 8; 2 Chron. v. 9). But although that subscription has been so faithfully preserved, it unfortunately affords us less information than we could desire. We learn from it only that our present collection was preceded by a primary collection of much less extent, and that the latter ended with the Salomonic Psalm, lxxii.; for it is not at all likely that the editor would have placed after that Psalm a subscription that refers only to prayers of David, unless he had found it in that position. And this being the case, it is natural to suppose that Solomon himself, prompted perhaps by the liturgical requirements of the new temple, formed this primary collection, and by appending Ps. lxxii. to it gave it to be understood that he was its compiler. But even to the question, whether, besides Ps. lxxii., the primary collection contained only hymns that were strictly Davidic, or whether the designation, תפלות דוד, was meant only *a potiori*, we have no answer. If we assume the latter alternative, we cannot understand why, of the Psalms of Asaph, only Ps. l. was received into it. For this Psalm ought really to be regarded as old-Asaphic, and might therefore have formed an integral part of the primary collection. On the other hand, the Korahitic Psalms (xlii.–xlix.) cannot possibly have all belonged to it; for some of them, and most undoubtedly xlvii. and xlviii., belong to the time of Jehoshaphat, the most memorable event of whose reign was predicted, as the Chronicler informs us, by an Asaphite and celebrated by Korahitic singers. For this reason therefore, and apart

altogether from other Psalms which bring us down to the time of the Assyrians (*e.g.* lxvi., lxvii.) and of Jeremiah (*e.g.* lxxi.) or even bear traces of the time of the Exile (*e.g.* lxix. 35 *ff.*), it is absolutely impossible that the primary collection should have consisted of Pss. ii.–lxxii., or rather (since it seems necessary to assign Ps. ii. to the later regal period, perhaps to the time of Isaiah) of Pss. iii.–lxxii. And if we conceive these later additions to be removed, there is left for the Psalms of David and his contemporaries no arrangement, which we could say bore in any way the stamp of the Davidic and Salomonic mind. This struck even old Jewish teachers; and it is related in the Midrasch on Ps. iii., that when Joshua ben Levi was purposing to rearrange the Psalms, a heavenly voice called to him: "Arouse not the slumberer" (אל־תפיחי את־הישן), *i.e.* disturb not David in his grave. No doubt we can explain more satisfactorily than is done there, why it is that Ps. iii. follows Ps. ii. (or, as it is expressed there in the Midrasch, why פרשת אבשלום follows פרשת גוג ומגוג); but, speaking generally, the principle of arrangement observable in the two first books is the same as that in the three last—the principle, viz. which I have shown in my *Symbolæ ad Psalmos illustrandos isagogicæ* (1846) runs through the whole Psalter, of arranging according to external rather than internal points of resemblance.[1] On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the nucleus of

[1] Eusebius has already perceived the right view in regard to this. In his exposition of Ps. lxiii. (lxii. in the Sept.), among other things he expresses himself as follows: *ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι τῆς τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων διανοίας ἕνεκεν ἐφεξῆς ἀλλήλων τοὺς ψαλμοὺς κεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον, οὕτως ἐν πολλοῖς ἐπιτηρήσας καὶ εὑρών. διὸ καὶ συνῆφθαι αὐτοὺς ὡσανεὶ συγγένειαν ἔχοντας καὶ ἀκολουθίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ἔνθεν μὴ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐμφέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τῆς διανοίας ἀκολουθίαν* (in Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*, t. i. p. 300). This *ἀκολουθία διανοίας*, however, is not always central and deep. The attempts of Luther (Walch, iv., col. 646 *ff.*), and especially of Solomon Gesner, to point out a connected inner progress in the Psalter, are not convincing.

the primary collection must lie within Pss. iii.–lxxii., for nowhere else do old Davidic Psalms stand so numerously and so closely together as here. Even the third book (Pss. lxxiii.–lxxxix.) is markedly different in this respect. We may therefore assume that the chief bulk of the oldest hymn-book of the Israelitish Church is contained in Pss. iii.–lxxii.; but at the same time we must admit that, on the occasion of later redactions, and more especially at the last of all, its contents were taken apart and re-arranged; although, when that was done, the connection of the subscription, lxxii. 20, with the Psalm of Solomon was maintained. These two groups of Psalms (iii.–lxxii., lxxiii.–lxxxix.), although not preserved in their original arrangement, and although augmented by interpolations of several kinds, represent at least the first two stages in the formation of the Psalter. The primary collection may be Salomonic. The after-gleaning that forms the second group was added, at the earliest, in the time of Jehoshaphat, in whose reign it is probable that the Salomonic Book of Proverbs was also compiled. There is more reason, however, for assigning this second group to the time of Hezekiah; and that not only because it seems necessary to refer a few of the Psalms contained in it to the overthrow of Assyria in the reign of Hezekiah, rather than to that of the allied neighbouring nations in the reign of Jehoshaphat, but more especially because the "men of Hezekiah" likewise arranged an after-gleaning to the older Salomonic Book of Proverbs (Prov. xxv. 1), and because it is related of Hezekiah that he brought the Psalms of David and those of Asaph (and the bulk of the latter are contained in the third book of Psalms) once more into use (2 Chron. xxix. 30).

In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the collection was enlarged by the hymns composed during the Exile, and still more so by those composed after it. But a gleaning of old hymns had also been reserved for this time. A Psalm of

Moses was placed first, in order that by means of this glance back into the earliest times the beginning of the new Psalter might readily arrest the attention. And, in addition to the fifty-six Davidic Psalms contained in the three first books, seventeen others have been gathered together into the two last; these, it is true, are not all directly Davidic, for some of them at least have been composed by singers who were able to put themselves into David's situation, and had drunk deeply into his spirit. Historical works of an annalistic or even a prophetical character, which had been rescued at the time of the Exile, and preserved for the post-exilic period, were probably a chief storehouse of such earlier Psalms. It was from such works that the historical notes attached to Davidic hymns (even to one in the fifth book: Ps. cxlii.) were derived. There is on the whole an unmistakable progress from the earliest to the latest; and we may say with Ewald, that the real kernel of Davidic, and, generally speaking, older hymns is contained in Pss. i.–xli., that it is mainly hymns of the middle period that are found in Pss. xlii.–lxxxix., and that the great mass of later and very late hymns must be sought in Pss. xc.–cl. But in other respects it is much the same with the Psalter as with the collections of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel: the arrangement is partly chronological and partly according to the subject matter, and in many places the chronological order is intentionally and significantly departed from in favour of the latter. We have already frequently adverted to one chief point of view of this arrangement according to matter, viz. the imitation of the Thôra; it was perhaps this that led to the fourth book, which corresponds with the Book of Numbers, opening with a Psalm of Moses which refers to Num. xiv. 35.

V. Arrangement and Titles.

Among the Fathers, Gregory of Nyssa has attempted to show that the Psalter in its five books leads up as it were by five stages to moral perfection: *ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπερτιθεὶς, ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον ἐφίκηται τῶν ἀγαθῶν*,[1] and even down to the most recent times attempts have been made to point out in the five books a gradation of fundamental and leading thoughts, that dominate and interpenetrate the whole.[2] We are afraid that investigation in this direction sets before itself an unattainable goal. Nevertheless, as will gradually appear, the collection bears the impress of one ordering spirit. For a didactico-prophetical couple of Psalms (Pss. i. and ii.), beginning and ending with אשרי— a couple which introduces the whole Psalter, and was therefore regarded in very early times as but one Psalm—forms its preface, while four Psalms (cxlvi.–cxlix.), that begin and end with הללויה, form its close. We do not include Ps. cl.; for this Psalm takes the place of the *Beracha* of the fifth book, just as the refrain in Isaiah xlviii. 22 is repeated with greater emphasis and more sonorously in lvii. 21, but is wanting at the end of the third division of these discourses of Isaiah to the exiles, seeing that instead of it the wretched final destiny of the wicked is described in terms that fill the mind with horror. The beginning of the Psalter celebrates the blessedness of those who walk in conformity with the redeeming will of God, that has been revealed in Thôra and in history; its close calls upon all creatures to magnify this redeeming God, upon the ground as it were of the completion of the work of redemption. Even Bede already calls attention to the fact, that from Ps. cxlvi. onwards the Psalter ends in pure exultation; the end of the Psalter soars to the blessed

[1] *Opp. ed. Paris.* (1638), t. i. p. 288.

[2] So especially Stähelin, *Zur Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 1859, 4to.

height of the consummation of all things. Ewald's assumption, that there was an evident predilection for attempting to make the number 150 complete, cannot be made good; the reckoning 147 (according to an Aggadic book mentioned in *jer. Schabbath*, c. xvi., parallel with the years of the life of Jacob), and the reckoning 149, which occurs frequently both in Karaitic and Rabbanitic MSS., have also been adopted; and the numbering varies both as regards the whole and as regards particular Psalms.[1]

There are found in the Psalter seventy-three Psalms provided with the title לדוד; viz. thirty-seven in book i., eighteen in book ii., one in book iii., two in book iv., and fifteen in book v. The redaction has evidently intended to close the collection with an imposing group of Davidic Psalms, just as it begins with the bulk of these. The Hallelujahs, which begin with Ps. cxlvi. (immediately after the fifteen Davidic Psalms), are already preludes of the closing doxology.

It is only in the second and third books that Korahitic and Asaphic Psalms are to be found. The Asaphic Psalms are twelve in number, viz. l., lxxiii.–lxxxiii. The Korahitic are also twelve, viz. xlii., xliii., xliv.–xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii., on the assumption that Ps. xliii. is to be regarded as an independent twin Psalm to xlii., and that Ps. lxxxviii. is to be accounted Korahitic. In both these groups of hymns we find Psalms dating from the time of the Exile, and even from the time after it (lxxiv., lxxix.,

[1] The LXX., like our Hebrew text, reckons 150 Psalms. It does so, however, with variations in particular instances; it unites ix. and x., also cxiv. and cxv., into one, and compensates for this by dividing cxvi. and cxlvii. each into two. The combination of ix. and x., and of cxiv. and cxv. into one, is also found elsewhere; cxxxiv. and cxxxv., but more especially i. and ii., also appear here and there as but one. Kimchi, combining Pss. cxiv. and cxv. into one, reckons 149. The Syriac versions combine Pss. cxiv. and cxv. into one; they however reckon 150, seeing that they divide cxlvii.

lxxxv.). We cannot therefore explain on purely chronological grounds why it is that they are apportioned only to books ii. and iii. Korahitic Psalms, followed by one that is Asaphic, open book ii.; Asaphic Psalms, followed by four that are Korahitic, open book iii.

The manner in which Davidic Psalms are interspersed with those we have just been considering sets before us very clearly the principle by which the compiler's favourite arrangement according to the subject matter is dominated. It is the principle of homogeneity. It is an old Semitic custom to put things together in accordance with this principle; for even in the alphabet, the hand and the hollow of the hand, water and fish, the eye and the mouth, the back and front of the head, have been placed together in accordance with it. So the Psalms also follow one another according as they are related by prominent external and internal marks. The Asaphic Psalm, l., is followed by the Davidic Psalm, li., because they both similarly disparage the material animal sacrifice, as compared with that which is personal and spiritual. And the Davidic Psalm, lxxxvi., is inserted between the Korahitic Psalms, lxxxv. and lxxxvii., because it is related not only to Ps. lxxxv. 8 by the prayer: "*Show me Thy way, Jahve,*" and "*give Thy conquering strength to Thy servant,*" but also to Ps. lxxxvii. by the prospect it holds out of the conversion of the heathen to the God of Israel. This phenomenon, that Psalms with the same leading thought, or even only with markedly similar passages, especially at the beginning and the end, are linked on to one another, may be observed throughout the whole of the collection. Thus, *e.g.* Ps. lvi., with the title, "*After* (the melody): *the silent dove among them that are afar off,*" is attached to Ps. lv., because of the expression that occurs in the latter: "*Oh that I had wings like a dove,*" etc.; and Pss. xxxiv. and xxxv. are placed together as being the only Psalms in which the "Angel of Jahve" is mentioned; so

also Pss. ix. and x., which coincide in the expression עתות בצרה.

Closely connected with this principle of arrangement is the circumstance that the Elohim Psalms, *i.e.* those which, in accordance with a peculiar style of composition, as I have shown in my *Symbolæ*, and not in consequence of the caprice of a redactor,[1] almost exclusively call God אלהים, and besides this delight in the use of such compound divine names as יהוה צבאות, יהוה אלהים צבאות, and the like, are placed together without any intermixture of Jehovistic Psalms. The divine name יהוה predominates in Pss. i.–xli.; it occurs 273 times, and אלהים only 15 times, and that too for the most part where יהוה was not admissible. The Elohistic type commences with Ps. xlii.; the last of this style is the Korahitic Psalm, lxxxiv., which is for this very reason attached to the Elohistic Psalms of Asaph. In Pss. lxxxv.–cl. יהוה appears again with such exclusiveness that in books iv. and v. it occurs 339 times, while אלהים is used but once (cxliv. 9) of the true God. Of the Psalms of David 18 are Elohistic, of the Korahitic 9, while the Asaphic are all of this form. Seeing we have to add one by Solomon and four that are anonymous, there are altogether 44 of this class (*i.e.* counting Pss. xlii. and xliii. as two). They form the middle portion of the Psalter, and have on their right 41 and on their left 65 Jahve-Psalms.

Similarity in respect of species of composition is also one of the manifold grounds that have determined this arrangement according to the subject-matter. Thus among the Elohim Psalms the מַשְׂכִּיל (xlii., xliii., xliv., xlv., lii.–lv.) and the מִכְתָּם (lvi.–lx.) stand together. Similarly in the two last books the שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת (cxx., cxxxiv.) and, divided into groups, those beginning with הוֹדוּ (cv.–cvii.) and those beginning

[1] This is Ewald's view—a view which is still current. A closer inspection of the other characteristic peculiarities of the Elohim Psalms proves it to be superficial and erroneous.

and ending with הַלְלוּיָהּ (cxi.–cxiii.; cxv.–cxvii.; cxlvi.–cl.), —from which it follows that these Psalm-titles are older than the final redaction of the collection.

After the harmless position that the monographs of Sonntag (1687), Celsius (1718), and Irhof (1728) take up with regard to the titles of the Psalms, it could not possibly be otherwise than that these should at length become a subject of criticism; but the negation of what has been historically handed down, that has grown prevalent since the last decades of the past century, has in these days become a scornful dogmatism, which in any other department of literature, where the judgment is not so much warped by prejudice, would be regarded as mere caprice. Instances like Hab. iii. 1 and 2 Sam. i. 18 (cf. Ps. lx. 1) show that David and other psalmists might have attached to their Psalms not only their names but also notes indicating their purport. And the great antiquity of these and similar titles may also be inferred from the fact, that the LXX. found them already in existence and did not understand them; that they cannot be explained even with the aid of the Books of Chronicles (including the Book of Ezra, which forms a part of these), in which much is said about music, and in which they make their appearance, like much else, as the revival of choice old expressions, so that the key to their comprehension must have been lost very early; as well as from the circumstance that they occur far less frequently in the two last than in the three first books of the Psalter.

VI. Strophe-System of the Psalms.

Old Hebrew poetry has neither rhyme nor metre; not till the seventh century after Christ did Jewish poetry adopt either (first rhyme and afterwards metre). Attempts at rhyme, it is true, are not wanting in the poetry and prophecy of the Old Testament, especially in the *Tefilla* style

(Ps. cvi. 4–7; cf. Jer. iii. 21–25), where the earnestness of prayer naturally leads to the heaping up of similar inflexional endings; but this assonance, which tends to pass over into rhyme proper, has not yet become such an established form as in Syriac.[1] Nor is it possible to adduce verses of even four lines, in which there is carried out a uniform or mixed metre. Nevertheless Augustine (*Ep.* cxiii. *ad Memorium*) is rightly informed, when he says regarding the Psalms: *Certis eos constare numeris credo illis qui eam linguam probe callent;* and it was not mere imagination that led Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome and others to perceive in the hymns of the Old Testament, and more especially in the Psalms, something similar to the Greek and Latin metres. For Hebrew poetry does have a certain measure, seeing that, apart from the simple vocal and composite *Schebâs*, both of which represent the primary short vowels, all syllables with a full vowel are intermediate in length, and become long in the rise and short in the fall, or, to put it otherwise, are there strongly accented, here more or less slurred over. This gives rise to a very great variety of rhythms, *e.g.* the anapæstic *wĕnăschlíchăh mĭmĕ́nnū ʿăbŏthémō* (ii. 3), or the dactylic *ăz jĕdăbbēr ēlémŏ bĕăppō* (ii. 5); the poetical discourse moves on more freely than does Syriac poetry with its constantly ascending (⏑ –) or descending (– ⏑) spondees, it exhibits all kinds of syllabic movement, and so comes to have the appearance of a motley mixture of Greek and Latin metres. Only the appearance, however —for such kinds of verse as are regulated by the laws of quantity are altogether foreign to old Hebrew poetry, as well as to the earliest poetry in general; these rhythms that vary in accordance with the emotion to be expressed are not metres, for, as Augustine says in his work *de Musica: omne metrum rhythmus, non omnis rhythmus etiam metrum*

[1] Cf. Zingerle in *D. M. Z.*, x. 110 ff.

est. Nor, indeed, is there a single instance in which a definite rhythm has been carried through a whole poem, whether of greater or less extent; but they always vary in accordance with the thoughts and feelings: thus, *e.g.*, the close of the evening hymn (Ps. iv.) rises to the anapæstic: *kiattâ Jahawé lebadâd*, in order then to sink to rest in the iambic: *labêtach tôschibêni*.[1] With this alternation of

[1] Saalschütz (*Von der Form der hebr. Poesie*, 1825, and elsewhere) proceeds upon the altogether misleading assumption, that our present system of accentuation does not indicate the syllable of the words that was really strongly accented;—adopting the pronunciation of the German-Polish Jews he finds almost everywhere a spondæo-dactylic rhythm (*e.g.* Judg. xiv. 18, *lûle charáschtem beeglâthi*). The traditional accentuation, however, may be proved to be a faithful transmission of the original Hebrew pronunciation; the trochaic pronunciation is more Syrian; and the tendency to draw back the accent from the final syllable to the penult and antepenult, without paying any regard to the conditions that originally governed it, is a phenomenon that is by no means uncommon in the later period of a language (*vid.* Hupfeld in *D.M.Z.*, vi. 187). In his work: *Die metrischen Formen der hebr. Poesie* (1866), Julius Ley attempts to show the great influence that alliteration, under which he subsumes rhyme, assonance, annomination (paronomasia), and playing upon words, has in it; and in his more exhaustive work: *Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebr. Poesie* (1875), he endeavours to make out that there is a measure which is determined, not by the number of syllables, but by the number of accentual rises, and that its fundamental form is the long octometric line (of 4 + 4 accentual rises). Both works start from correct observations and are rich in pertinent remarks, although the author is too systematic and draws conclusions from his observations that are not in harmony with fact. While he starts from the old German pronunciation, the Syriac has become regulative for Gustav Bickell. He has applied his new hypothesis regarding the metrical system of Hebrew poetry to the Psalms and other poetical portions of the Old Testament with great confidence and violent consistency (*Metrices Biblicæ regulæ*, 1879. *Carmina V. T. metrice: notas criticas et diss. de re metrica Hebræorum adjecit*, 1882. *Dichtungen der Hebräer, zum erstenmale nach dem Versmasse des Urtextes übers.*, in two small volumes, 1882. *Vid.* also articles in *D. M. Z.*). He maintains that the form of Hebrew poetry is essentially the same as that of the Syriac, *i.e.* that the measure of the verse is determined by the number of syllables and that there is a regular alternation of accented and unaccented syllables. According to this hypothesis, verses

accentual rise and fall, of length and brevity—an alternation which, in impassioned passages, answers to their purport—there is combined in Hebrew poetry an aptitude for depicting by means of tones, that can hardly be shown to exist anywhere else to the same extent. Thus, *e.g.* ii. 5 *a* sounds like a peal of thunder, to which 5 *b* is related like the flash of lightning. And there is a whole series of deep-toned Psalms (*e.g.* xvii., xlix., lviii., lix., lxxiii.), in which the description drags along heavily and obscurely, and in which especially the suffixes in *mo* are heaped up, the angry mood impressing itself upon the style, and making itself audible in the sound of the words. The *non plus ultra* of such poetry as paints by means of tones is the cycle of the prophecies of Isaiah contained in chaps. xxiv.–xxvii.

The so-called *parallelismus membrorum* has also been rightly looked at from the point of view of rhythm. This is the fundamental law, not only of the poetical, but also of the rhetorical, and therefore, speaking generally, of the higher style [1]—a law, for which this appropriate name has

with an even number of syllables have a trochaic rhythm (e.g. *ašre hâiš 'šĕr lo hálakh bá' 'ṣat r'šá'im*), while those that have an uneven number have an iambic rhythm (e.g. *ub' dark châṭṭaîm lo 'ámad*). These two lines are sufficient to show how unnatural this theory is, and how far from agreeable are the results attained by means of it. In ii. 7 the *Athnach* member, יהוה אמר אלי בני אתה, is distorted into *amar 'Eli b'ni-tta*, in order that it may furnish two complete iambics. The learned author has been led by his predilection for Syriac into a wrong track. Hebrew poetry is not metrical, *i.e.* it is not regulated by the laws of quantity and by the number of syllables; strong accents, which give prominence to the logically most important syllables, produce a very great variety of rhythms in the series of syllables that form the *stichoi;* the ictus of the verse is regulated by the logical movement; and the rhythm is the purely accentuating rhythm of the oldest kinds of national poetry. *Vid.* on ii. 1.

[1] On the parallelism of the members as the fundamental law also of Greek art, not only of the chorus, but also of the commatic portions of the drama, *vid.* Moritz Schmidt, *Ueber den Bau der Pindarischen Strophen*, 1882.

but recently been coined.[1] The two parallel members are really related to one another in exactly the same way as the two halves on either side of the principal cæsura of the hexameter and pentameter. This comes out with special clearness in the bi-partite long lines of the cæsural (more correctly, diæretic) scheme, *e.g.* in Ps. xlviii. 6, 7 : *They beheld, straightway they were amazed,* | *confounded, they hasted away. Trembling has taken hold of them there,* | *anguish, as of a woman in travail.* Here the one thought is unfolded in the same verse in two parallel members. It is not, however, the necessity of such a development of the thought that gives rise to the rhythm, but, conversely, the requirements of the rhythm give rise to this way of developing the thought. This we learn from the fact that the rhythmical articulation is sometimes carried out without this logical development, as *e.g.*, in *vv.* 4 and 8 of the same Psalm : *Elohim in her palaces* | *became known as a refuge. By an east wind Thou didst break in pieces* | *the ships of Tarshish.* Here there is neither synonymous or identical (tautological), nor antithetical, nor synthetical parallelism ; there is only that which de Wette calls rhythmical, only the rhythmical form of the rise and fall, the diastole and systole, which poetry (with-

[1] Abenezra says instead כָּפוּל, *duplicatum*, and Kimchi כְּפֶל עִנְיָן בְּמִלּוֹת שׁוֹנוֹת, *duplicatio sententiæ verbis variatis ;* both regard it simply as an elegant form of expression (דרך צחות). Even Azaria de Rossi in his מאור עינים (1573–75) has not yet the knowledge of this fundamental law of parallelism to which Bishop Lowth in his *Prælectiones de Sacra Poesi Hebræorum* (1753, translated completely into English in 1787 and freq.) has attained. To the latter belongs the honour of having first seen thoroughly into the law of parallelism, and of having distinguished between its most common forms, the synonymous, the antithetical, and synthetical. Unknown to him, Christian Schoettgen had prepared the way for him in his *Horæ* (1733), where he treats of this phenomenon in a special excursus, *de exergasia sacra* (p. 1249–1263), beginning : *exergasia quid sit, omnes Rhetorum libelli docent, conjunctio scilicet integrarum sententiarum idem significantium. Vid.* J. H. Cook, *Bishop Lowth : his life and writings*, pp. 45–51.

out, however, binding itself) is wont to fill up with two different kinds of ascending and descending logical articulation. It is not usual, however, for the rising and falling rhythm to be found within the compass of one line; it is more commonly distributed over two lines, each of which is a respiration by itself, and which are related to one another as rhythmical protasis and apodosis, as προῳδός and ἐπῳδός. This distich is the simplest ground-form of the strophe, which is already discernible in the earliest hymn that has been handed down to us (Gen. iv. 23*f.*). The whole of Ps. cxix. runs in such distichs, which is also the usual form of the apophthegm. In the case of Ps. cxix. the acrostic letter stands at the head of each distich, just as in the case of Ps. cxi. and cxii., which are likewise in distichs, it stands at the head of the individual lines. The tristich grows out of the distich, the ascending rhythm being maintained through two lines, and the fall not occurring till the third; *e.g.* in Ps. xxv. 7 (the ג of this alphabetical Psalm):

Hold not the sins of my youth nor my transgressions in remembrance,
According to Thy grace remember Thou me,
For Thy goodness' sake, Jahve!

This is at least the way in which the tristich would naturally originate; moreover, while its logical articulation may be exceedingly various, it has always this as its indispensable characteristic, that the full fall is reserved for the third line; *e.g.*, in the two first strophes of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, where each line is a long bipartite line consisting of a rise and a fall, a principal fall behind the cæsura of the third long line closes the strophe:

Alas! how doth the city sit solitary, wont to be full of people!
She is become as a widow, the great one among nations,
The princess among provinces, she is become tributary.

By night she weepeth, yea, she weepeth, and tears are on her cheeks;
She hath none to comfort her among all her lovers;
All her friends dealt treacherously with her, are become her enemies.

If now we inquire further, whether Hebrew poetry advances beyond these simplest and most rudimentary forms of the strophe, and enlarges the net of the rhythmic period by combining two and three-line strophes with a rising and falling rhythm into greater wholes, that form complete strophes by themselves, we find a satisfactory answer, first of all, in the alphabetical Psalm xxxvii., for this is almost entirely tetrastichic, *e.g.*—

> As to evil-doers fret not thyself,
> As to workers of iniquity be thou not envious,
> For they shall soon be cut down like grass,
> And wither like the green herb—

although, seeing that the unmistakable landmarks of the arrangement (*viz.* the letters of the alphabet) allow a freer movement, it sometimes increases the compass of the strophe even to that of the pentastich (*vv.* 25, 26):

> Never yet have I, once young but now grown old,
> Seen a righteous man forsaken,
> And his seed begging for bread.
> He ever giveth and lendeth,
> And his seed is blessed.

This is all the information regarding the Hebrew strophe-system that we can derive with certainty from the alphabetical Psalms.[1] From them, however, we take with us a result of great importance for our further investigations, the result, viz. that the verse bounded by *Sôf pasûk*, the marking off of which is coeval with the accentuation first mentioned in the post-Talmudic tractate *Sofrim*,[2] is by no means

[1] Even the older expositors here and there conjecture that it is from these that we should start in our investigations. Serpilius, *e.g.* says: "It might perhaps occur to some one to enquire, whether we might not be able to draw some conclusions regarding David's versification and poetry from his, so to speak, alphabetical Psalms."

[2] Even if it were the case, as Hupfeld and Riehm (*Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1866, p. 300) have objected, that the books of the Old Testament were already divided into verses, פסוקים, before the time of the Masoretes, it

(as is still commonly assumed since Köster, 1831, *d.* 16 Dec., 1878,) the original unit of the strophe, but that strophes are wholes made up of an equal or symmetrical number of stichs.[1] Hupfeld (*Einleit.*, § 5) has objected to this, that it "is diametrically opposed to the nature of the rhythm (= parallelism), which cannot stand upon one leg, but demands two, and that therefore the distich is the rhythmical unit." But does it follow from this, that a strophe is to be measured by the number of the distichs? The distich is itself already the smallest strophe, viz. one consisting of two lines. And to measure a greater strophe by the number of the distichs is already forbidden by the fact, that the rhythmical unit, the ground-form of which is the distich, may equally well be tristichic, and consequently these so-called rhythmical units form parts that are of equal value neither as regards time nor space. Still less, however, is this the

would nevertheless be true, that the division into verses as they are now fixed and marked off by *Sof pasuk*, and more especially that of the three poetical books, is Masoretic.

[1] These stichs, of which there are, according to the Talmud (*Kiddu-schin*, 30 *a*, cf. Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 11), eight more in the Psalter than in the Thôra, viz. 5896, whereas the number of Masoretic verses is 2527, were originally called פסוקים. Even in Augustine *versus* is used in the same sense as στίχος. With him the words *Populus ejus et oves pascuæ ejus* are one *versus*. The Syrians use *pethgom* instead; according to the final manuscript editions, the Psalter consists of 4832 *pethgome*. There is not a single Hebrew MS. which could be used as a basis for the stichical representation of the Psalms; those which we now possess always break the Masoretic verse, if the length of the line admits of it, into two halves, without even regarding the general injunction in ch. xiv. of the tractate *Sofrim* and of Ben-Bileam in his *Horajoth ha-Kore*, that the breaks are to be regulated by the beginnings of the verses and by the two great pausal accents. The פסוקים, however, were not merely lines occupying a certain space, as was generally the case with the στίχοι or ἔπη, according to the number of which the compass of Greek works is indicated, but lines determined by the sense, κῶλα (Suidas: κῶλον ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος), just as Jerome wrote his Latin version of the Old Testament, after the model of the Hexapla of Origen, *per cola et commata*, *i.e.* arranged it in lines the length of which was determined by the sense.

case with the Masoretic verses. It is true that in our larger Commentary on the Psalms (ii. 252 *f.*) we have maintained, in opposition to Ewald, and herein in agreement with Hupfeld, that the accentuation proceeds upon the law of dichotomy. But not only must the Masoretic division of the verses occasionally allow the law of dichotomy to fall into abeyance, when the verse (as *e.g.* xviii. 2, xxv. 1, xcii. 9) admits only of a syntactical division and not of a bisection into distichs; it even subjects to this law not only verses of three members, as *e.g.* i. 1 and ii. 2, in which the third member is related complementarily or synthetically to the other two—and both these are phenomena that of themselves bear witness to the relative independence of the verse-lines—but also verses of four members, both where the sense demands it (*e.g.* in i. 3, xviii. 16), and where it does not (*e.g.* in xxii. 15, xl. 6). And these Masoretic verses of such various compass are the constituent elements, according to the equal number of which strophes should be measured? Dillmann still maintains this in his Commentary on Job (1869), whereas Merx (*Job*, 1871) and Bickell (*Carmina V. T. metrice*, p. 231), rightly deny it. How can even numbers of Masoretic verses be called strophes? They may be regarded as sections, into which the discourse in question admits of being divided so far as regards its purport; but they do not coincide with the constituent elements of its poetical form. It is in virtue of its symmetrical relation to others that a strophe first becomes a strophe; it must have the same time for the ear, and the same form for the eye; it must therefore present the same number of lines as determined by the sense. That these lines, in accordance with the fundamental rhetorical law of the loftier Hebrew style, move on with that rising and falling rhythmical movement, which we call parallelism, until they reach the point of rest at the close of the strophe—this alone does not of itself stamp a composition as poetical, for even prophecy advances in such parallel members; the poetical

form, which is in its origin the form in which a discourse is sung to the accompaniment of music and dancing, demands the recurrence of homogeneous sections, the length of which must not be so great as to render them undistinguishable by the ear. This length is determined by the number of the lines (stichs). Strophes are recurring sections consisting of a measured and indeed symmetrical number of lines. At the same time the movement of the thought in parallel members is not interfered with. Far from placing the rhythm upon one leg, we leave it its two; we however measure the strophe, not by the dipodia of Masoretic verses or even couples of verses, but by the equal or symmetrically alternating number of their members, which occur for the most part in twos, often enough, however, in threes, and occasionally even in fours.

Whether a Psalm is laid out in strophes, and how, we may ascertain by observing, first, what are its sections as determined by the sense, where the flow of the thoughts and feelings subsides, in order to rise anew, and, secondly, by considering whether these sections have an equal or at least a symmetrically corresponding number of stichs (*e.g.* 6, 6, 6, 6 or 6, 7, 6, 7), or, if their compass be too great to admit of our recognising them as strophes without more investigation, whether they may be broken up into such smaller wholes consisting of an equal or symmetrical number of stichs. For the peculiarity of the Hebrew strophe does not consist in a flow of definite metres combined into one harmonious whole (like, *e.g.* the Sapphic strophe, to which the four-membered verses of Isa. xvi. 9, 10, with their short concluding lines, which correspond to the Adonic verse, bear a striking resemblance), but in a relatively complete train of thought being developed in accordance with the distichic and tristichic ground-form of the rhythmic period.[1] The

[1] This is true also of the Assyrian hymns (*e.g.* the penitential Psalm in Schrader's *Höllenfahrt der Istar*, 1874, p. 92*f.*), and of the old Egyp-

strophe-schemes, that come out in this way, are exceedingly various. We find not only cases in which all the strophes of the poem are the same in compass (*e.g.* 4, 4, 4, 4), but also cases in which the poem is made of dissimilar strophes arranged in symmetrical proportions. The condition laid down by some,[1] that only a poem consisting of strophes of the same length can be regarded as strophic, is refuted not only by Syriac,[2] but also by post-biblical Jewish poetry.[3] Instances occur in which strophes that are the same in compass are followed by strophes that are different (*e.g.* 4, 4, 6, 6) ; in which, as in the chiasmus, the outer and inner strophes are the same (*e.g.* 4, 6, 6, 4) ; in which the first and third, the second and fourth, correspond to one another (*e.g.* 4, 6, 4, 6) ; in which the mixture of the strophes is antistrophic, *i.e.* they are repeated in an inverse order (*e.g.* 4, 6, 7, 7, 6, 4) ; in which strophes of the same compass are grouped around one whose compass is much greater (*e.g.* 4, 4, 10, 4, 4), a scheme which Köster calls the pyramidal ; in which equal strophes are followed by a short finale (*e.g.* 3, 3, 2) ; in which a longer strophe forms the pedestal, as it were, of the whole (*e.g.* 5, 3, 3, 7) ; and these are far from being all the varieties of figures that the hymns of the Old Testament, and more especially the Psalms, present to the eye, when we break them up, according to their purport, into stichs.

As regards the compass of the strophe, the analogy of

tian hymns, where the end of the strophe is indicated by a red point, and its beginning by the initial word being written in red. *Vid.* the appendix *on the Metrical System of the Psalms* in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

[1] *E.g.* by Meyer, who, in his *Gesch: der poetischen Nationallit. der Heb.*, p. 67, maintains that strophes of dissimilar length are opposed to the simplest laws of lyric poetry and of melody. But the conditions which melody imposes upon the formation of the verse and the strophe were not applied so strictly by the ancients as by us ; and, moreover, is the sonnet not a lyric poem ?

[2] *Vid.* Zingerle in *D.M.Z.*, x. 123, 124.

[3] *Vid.* Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, pp. 92–94.

Syriac and synagogical poetry justifies us in expecting to find them consisting of as many as twelve lines. The verse-line commonly consists of three words, or at least only of three longish words; in this respect the Hebrew language shows a capacity for expressing itself in an emphatically terse manner, which our language does not possess. This measure is frequently adhered to uniformly throughout long passages, not only in the Psalms, but also in the Book of Job. For it is now acknowledged, at least by Merx, that the Book of Job is also arranged strophically; and much more can be said in favour of this theory than for the observation by G. Hermann of a strophic plan in the Bucolics of Virgil, and by Köchly of a similar arrangement in the older portions of Homer.[1]

VII. Temple Music and Psalmody.

The Thôra contains nothing as to the liturgical use of vocal and instrumental music, except the direction regarding the ritualistic use of the silver trumpets that were to be blown by the priests (Num. x.). The real creator of liturgical music is David, to whose arrangements, as we learn from the Books of Chronicles, all later arrangements were traced, and which were fallen back upon in times of declension. So long as David lived, the chief direction of the liturgical music remained in his hands (1 Chron. xxv. 2). The cymbals (מְצִלְתַּיִם or צֶלְצְלִים),[2] which served instead of the baton

[1] It may be mentioned in passing, that Schwerdt (*Ueber die innere Form der horazischen Oden*, 1868), counting by verse-lines, finds in Horace i. 1 the schema 10, 8, 10, 8; in i. 4 the schema 8, 4, 8, and much more of the same kind—whether rightly or wrongly we do not seek to determine (*Vid. Allg. Zeitung*, 1868, pp. 4583*f.*).

[2] Talmudic צְלָצַל. The usual Levitical orchestra of the temple of Herod consisted of two Nabla players, nine cithern players, and one who struck the *Zelazal*, viz. Ben-Arza (*Erachin*, 10 *a*, and also *Tamid*, vii. 3), who had also the oversight of the *Duchan* (*Tosefta* to *Schekalim*, c. 2).

were the instrument by means of which the three precentors (Heman, Asaph, Ethan-Jeduthun) conducted; the harps (נְבָלִים) represented the soprano, and the citherns, which were an octave lower, the bass (1 Chron. xv. 17–21); and, as we may infer from the לְנַצֵּחַ in the passage just cited, the latter were also used, when the pieces were practised under the direction of the מְנַצֵּחַ appointed for that purpose. Wherever in a Psalm סֶלָה (*vid.* on Ps. iii.) was written on the margin, the stringed instruments (as is expressly stated in ix. 17: הִגָּיוֹן סֶלָה) and the instruments generally were to strike in, in such a way as to give intensity to that which was being sung.[1] Besides the instruments mentioned in Ps. cl. and 2 Sam. vi. 5, there was also the flute, the liturgical use of which (*vid.* on v. 1) in the time of the first as well as of the second temple is unquestionable; it formed the proper musical accompaniment of the *Hallel* (*vid.* Ps. cxiii.) and of the nightly torchlight festivals on the semi-festival days of the Feast of Tabernacles (*Succa*, 15 *a*). The trumpets (חֲצֹצְרוֹת), and probably also the horn (שׁוֹפָר, lxxxi. 4, xcviii. 6, cl. 3), were blown exclusively by the priests, who took no part in the singing—for even in 1 Chron. xvi. 42 it is only priestly trumpets, co-operating with the Levitical choirs, that can be meant—according to 2 Chron. v. 12 *f.* (where the number of the two Mosaic trumpets appears increased to a hundred and twenty) they were sounded *unisono* with the singing and the playing of the Levites. At the dedication of Solomon's temple the Levites sing and play and the priests blow trumpets עֲנָדִם (2 Chron. vii. 6); and at the consecration of the cleansed temple under Hezekiah, the music of the Levites and priests resounds in concert till all the burnt offerings are placed upon the altar fire, and only then (probably while the wine was being poured out) did the singing of the Le-

[1] Cf. Mattheson's "*Erläutertes Selah*," 1745: Selah is a word marking a prelude, interlude, or after-piece with instruments, an indication of the places where the instruments play alone, in short, a so-called *ritornello*.

vites begin, no further mention being made of the priests (2 Chron. xxix. 26–30). In the second temple it was otherwise: in it the blowing of the trumpets by the priests and the singing of the Levites with its appropriate musical accompaniment were successive, not simultaneous. As a general rule the congregation took no part in the singing, but only uttered its Amen; in the *Hallel*, however, and in a few Psalms, it fell in after the first clause with the repetition of it, and after the second, with Hallelujah (Maimûni, *Hilchoth Megilla*, 3). 1 Chron. xvi. 36 points to a similar participation on the part of the congregation in the time of the first temple. So also does Jer. xxxiii. 11 so far as regards the "*Give thanks unto Jahve, for He is good.*" From Ezra iii. 10 *f.* we may also infer that there was a participation in the singing on the part of the congregation, which, if not antiphonal, was at least hypophonal (responsory).[1] The Psalter itself knows even of a participation in the liturgical music on the part of the עלמות (cf. משׁררות, Ezra ii. 65), whose treble was represented by the Levite boys in the second temple (*vid.* on xlvi. 1), and speaks of a praising of God "in full choirs" (xxvi. 12, lxviii. 27). And singing of a responsory nature is of ancient date in Israel: Miriam along with the women answers the choir of men (להם, Exod. xv. 21) in alternating song; and at the dedication of the city walls, Nehemiah (xii. 27 *ff.*) arranges the Levites, that form part of the procession moving towards the temple, in two large choirs, which are

[1] Antiphonal singing of the Psalms is traced back by Barhebræus and other old writers to Ignatius. According to Theodoret (*H. E.*, ii. 24) it was Flavian and Diodore of Antioch that naturalised it in the Church. The singing is antiphonal, when the text is so divided, that the one company of the singers begins, and the other continues; it is hypophonal (responsory) when the second company (the congregation) repeats final words, or concludes with special short clauses. The two kinds are identical in Ps. cxxxvi., where the *hypo-psalma*, כי לעולם חסדו, is at the same time the second half of each verse, and the hypophon is therefore also an antiphon.

there called תודות. In the time of the second temple each day of the week had its Psalm. The Psalm for Sunday was xxiv.; for Monday, xlviii.; for Tuesday, lxxxii; for Wednesday, xciv.; for Thursday, lxxxi; for Friday, xciii.; for Sabbath, xcii. This arrangement is at least as old as the period of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ; for the Talmudic statements are confirmed by the titles of Pss. xxiv., xlviii., xciv., and xciii. in the LXX. (also by the title of Ps. lxxxi. in the Old-Latin version: *quinta sabbati*), and, so far as regards the connection of the daily Psalms with the drink-offering, by Sir. l. 14–16. The Psalm for the day of the week was sung at the time of the drink offering (נֶסֶךְ), which was conjoined with the morning *Tamid*:[1] two priests, who stood on the right and the left of the person who gave the signal by striking the cymbal (*Zelazal*), sounded the trumpets at each of the nine sections (פרקים), in which it was sung by the Levites, and the people fell down and worshipped.[2] Of the Levites who stood upon the *Suggestus* (דוכן), *i.e.* a broad stair consisting of a few steps, which led up from the court of the people to that of the priests, and who were at once singers and players, and therefore played only on stringed and percussion instruments (not on wind instruments), there were at least twelve—nine with citherns, two with harps, and one with the cymbal; on certain days the flute was also added.[3] It was only in a few cases that the usual *Suggestus*

[1] According to the principle, אין אומר שירה אלא על היין, "one sings not except over the wine."

[2] *Rosch ha-Schana*, 31 *a*. *Tamid*, vii. 3; cf. the introduction to Ps. xcii.

[3] In the daily liturgical service there were, according to *Erachin*, 10 *a*, (1) from 21 to, at the most, 48 blasts of the trumpet; (2) from 2 to, at the most, 6 Nablás; (3) from 2 to, at the most, 12 flutes (חלילין.) Blowing the flute is called striking the flute (הַכָּה הֶחָלִיל). The flute was "struck" before the altar upon twelve days of the year: on the 14th of Nisan, at the slaying of the Paschal lamb (at which the *Hallel* was sung), on the 14th of Ijar, at the slaying of the Passover in the second month (cf. Num. ix. 9–13; 2 Chron. xxx. 2), on the 1st and 7th day of the Feast

on the staircase to the side of the altar was changed for another; for it is noted as something special that at the festival of the drawing of water at the Feast of Tabernacles the singers had a different position (*vid.* introduction to Pss. cxx.–cxxxiv), and that the flute-players who accompanied the *Hallel* stood before the altar (לפני המזבח, *Erachin*, 10 *a*). The choir of boys who stood at the lower end of the *Suggestus* at the feet of the Levites sang the treble (*vid.* on Ps. xlvi.). The daily שִׁיר הקרבן, *i.e.* the Psalm for the day of the week that concluded the morning sacrifice, was sung in nine, or perhaps more correctly three,[1] sections, and the pauses were indicated by the trumpet-blasts of the priests (*vid.* on Pss. xxxviii., lxxxi. 4); besides the seven Psalms which were sung week by week, there were others appointed for the public worship on the feast days and the intervening feast days

of the Passover, and on the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. The mouth-piece (אֲבוּב, according to the explanation of Maimûni) was not of metal, but a reed (cf. Arab. *anbûb*, a reed-stalk), because that has a more melodious sound. And it was always only one flute (אבוב יחידי, playing a solo), that resounded at the end of a measure and concluded it, because that forms the finest close (חִלּוּק). On the twelve days mentioned, the *Hallel* was sung to the accompaniment of flutes. On the other days, the Psalm for the day was accompanied by Nablás, cymbals, and citherns. In the passage of the tractate *Erachin* mentioned above, the question is even discussed, who the flute-players were. On the flute-playing at the festival of the drawing of water, *vid.* my *Gesch. der jüd. Poesie*, p. 195. In the temple of Herod there was, according to *Erachin*, 10 *b*, also an organ, and that too not a water-organ (הדרולום, *Hydraulis*), but a wind-organ (מַגְרֵפָה) with a hundred different tones (מיני זמר), whose thunder-like sound was heard, according to Jerome (*Opp. ed. Mart.*, v. 191) *ab Jerusalem usque ad montem Oliveti et amplius; vid.* Saalschütz, *Archäol.* i. 281–284.

[1] This is the view of Maimûni, who apportions the nine trumpet-blasts, by which, according to *Succa*, 53 *b*, the morning sacrifice was accompanied, to three sections of the song. The hymn *Haazinu* (Deut. xxxii.), which is specially called שִׁירת הלוים, was sung at the Sabbath *Musaph*-sacrifice, each Sabbath one of the six sections into which it was divided, so that it always began afresh on every seventh Sabbath. *Vid. j. Megilla*, section iii. *ad fin.*

(*vid.* on Ps. lxxxi.), and we read in *Biccurim*, iii. 4, that when a procession of people with firstfruits had reached the temple hill accompanied by the playing of flutes, and the first fruits were brought up in baskets, Ps. xxx. was struck up by the Levites, as the offerers entered into the Azara. This singing was different from the manner in which the Tefilla (*vid.* on Ps. xliv., *ad fin.*) and the blessing of the priests (*vid.* on Ps. lxvii.) were delivered, neither of which was accompanied by music; it was different also, as it seems, from the manner of delivering the *Hallel*, which was recited rather than sung (*Pesachim*, קָרְאוּ אֶת הַהַלֵּל). It was probably similar to the Arabic, which delights in shrill, long-breathed, quavering, and more especially even nasal tones. For it is related of one of the principal singers, Hogras ben Levi, that in order to diversify the tones, he put his thumb in his mouth and his forefinger בֵּין הַנִּימִין (between the hairs, *i.e.*, according to Raschi, on the furrow of the upper lip), and thus, by forming his mouth and nose as it were into a speaking trumpet, produced tones, before the volume of which the priests recoiled with their head thrown back.[1] This way of singing the Psalms in the temple of Herod was far from being the original way; and even if the present accentuation of the Psalter represented the fixed form of temple music, it would still afford us no idea of that previous to the Exile. As a matter of fact, however, it does neither the one nor the other.

The accents are only musical and, indirectly, interpunctional signs for the cantillating mode of delivery that was adopted in the synagogues. And, moreover, we no longer possess the key to the accents of the three metrical books (*i.e.* those that consist of symmetrical stichs and strophes) as musical signs. For the so-called *Sarka*-tables (which, beginning with *Zarka*, זִרְקָא, indicate the value of the accents

[1] *Vid. Joma*, 38 *b*, and *j. Schekalim* v. 3; cf. *Canticum Rabba* on Canticles iii. 6.

as notes), *e.g.* at the end of the second edition of Nägelsbach's Grammar, refer only to the delivery of the lessons taken from the Pentateuch and the prophets, and therefore indicate only the so-called prose system of accentuation. There is no tradition regarding the value of the so-called metrical accents as notes;[1] the Psalms are not recited according to the accents, but for all of them together there are several more or less formal modes, which are not determined by the accents, and regarding which we cannot say anything that is generally applicable, seeing that there is great diversity in the usage (*minhag*) of different countries.[2] It is only by way of conjecture that we can in some measure determine how the Psalms were to be recited according to the accents. For we still possess at least a few statements of Ben-Ascher, Schemtob, and Moses Provenzale (in his grammatical didactic poem, בִּשְׁם קדמין) regarding the intonation of individual metrical accents *Pazer* and *Schalschéleth* have a like intonation, which rises quaveringly; though *Schalschéleth* is drawn out longer, about a third longer than that of the prose books. *Legarmeh* (in form *Mahpach* or *Azla* followed by *Psik*) has a clear high tone; before *Zinnor*, however, it is deeper and more broken; *Rebia magnum* has a soft tone tending to repose. In *Silluk* the tone is raised at first, and then sinks to repose. The tone

[1] All attempts to decipher the original melodies of the Psalms and the poetical passages in general out of the accents are for this reason purely imaginary. Speidel (1740), Anton (in Paulus' later *Repertorium* and elsewhere, from 1780–1800), and Leop. Haupt (*Sechs alttest. Ps. mit ihren aus den Accenten entzifferten Singweisen*, 1854, and in Bd. 54 *des Neuen Lausitzischen Magazins*) have attempted this in different ways; the two last are to be envied on account of the knowledge of music displayed in their works. The hypothesis of Arend is still more fantastical (*Ueber den Sprachgesang der Vorzeit und die Herstellbarkeit der althebr. Vokalmusik*, 1867): he proceeds upon the assumption that the vowels themselves exhibit a scale of sounds and tones, and that, too, a scale that consists of 1½ octaves.

[2] Cf. my treatise: *Physiologie und Musik, etc.* (with supplements of notes), 1868.

of *Mercha* is according to its name *andante* and sinking into the depths; the tone of *Tarcha* corresponds with *adagio*. Further hints cannot be traced; still we may infer with respect to *Olewejored* (*Mercha mahpachatum*) and *Athnach*, that their intonation must have formed a cadence, as well as that *Rebia parvum* and *Zinnor* (*Zarka*) had a modulation that hurried on to the following principal disjunctive accent. If we further arrange *Dechi* (*Tiphcha initiale*) and *Rebia gereschatum* along with the other six *servi* in the form of notes, we may, it is true, bring out a *Sarka*-table of the metrical system of accentuation; but we cannot guarantee its exact agreement with the original manner of singing.

Following the precedent of Gerbert (*De musica sacra*) and Martini (*Storia della musica*), the view is at present widely diffused, that in the eight Gregorian chants together with the additional one (*tonus peregrinus*),[1] which is used only for Ps. cxiii. (= cxiv.–cxv. according to the Hebrew way of counting), we possess a remnant of the ancient temple-music; and considering the Jewish nationality of the early Christian Church, and that it was only gradually that it broke off its connection with the Temple and the Synagogue, this is by no means improbable. Not only Melchitic, but also Jacobitic Syriac liturgies are acquainted with those eight ܟܠܝ, while more recent Nestorian liturgies know also the ܟܠܝ ܕܥܡܝܩ.[2] In the monasteries of

[1] *Vid.* Friedr. Hommel's German Psalter, 1859; 2nd edit., 1879. The Psalms are there broken up into stichs, it being rightly assumed as the original and most appropriate arrangement, that antiphonal singing has to alternate, not in accordance with verses, as is at present the case in the Romish and Anglican Churches, but in accordance with the two members into which each verse is divided (*vid.* the above-cited passage of the Ecclesiastical History of Theodoret, ii. 24, and Basil, *ep.* lxiii. *ad Neocæsar.*: ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει παρ' ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς προσευχῆς καὶ εἰς τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν καθίστανται· καὶ νῦν μὲν διχῇ διανεμηθέντες ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις).

[2] *Vid.* Dietrich, *De Psalterii usu, etc., in eccl. Syriaca*, p. 4 *f.*

Bethlehem, which St. Paula founded, Psalms were sung at six hours of prayer from early morning till midnight, and she herself was so well versed in Hebrew, *ut Psalmos hebraice caneret et sermonem absque ulla Latinæ linguæ proprietate personaret* (*Ep.* 108 *ad Eustoch.*, c. 26). This points to a connection between the Psalm-melodies of the Church and the Synagogue, so far as regards the *mos orientalium partium*, the oriental psalmody, which Ambrose first introduced into the Church of Milan. In the course of this transmission, however, it is hardly likely that the Jewish tradition has remained altogether unchanged; it has been further developed under the influence of the Greek theory of music, although in such a way that it can still be recognised.[1] In Bagdad, the ancient seat of the Geonim (גאונים), Pethachja of Ratisbon, the Jewish traveller in the 12th century, heard the Psalms sung in a peculiar manner;[2] and there also, and in the same century, Benjamin of Tudela formed the acquaintance of a skilful singer of the Psalms that were used in public worship. Saadia (on Ps. vi. 1) infers from על־השמינית that there were eight Psalm-melodies (الحان). Eight נגינות are also mentioned elsewhere,[3] perhaps not without reference to those eight church-melodies, which are found also among the Armenians.[4] And it is possible that even the twofold way in which the accents are employed to regulate the chanting, which is borne witness to in old books of ritual,[5] is connected with the distinction between the solemn and the more simple ferial manner of singing in the Gregorian church-music.

[1] *Vid.* Saalschütz, *Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebräern*, 1829, p. 121, and Otto Strauss, *Geschichtliche Betrachtung über den Psalter als Gesang- und Gebetbuch*, 1859.

[2] *Vid. Literaturblatt des Orients*, 4th year, col. 541.

[3] Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 336 *f.*

[4] *Vid.* Petermann, *Ueber die Musik der Armenier*, in *D. M. Z.*, v. 368*f.*

[5] *Vid.* Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 115.

The knowledge of the value of the accents as musical notes would contribute nothing to the comprehension of the Psalms. So much the more indispensable, however, is a knowledge of the interpunctional value of the disjunctive accents and of those conjunctives, which under certain conditions take the place of disjunctives, and with the same logical effect. The principal disjunctive peculiar to the poetical system of accentuation is *Olewejored* with *Athnach* as divider of the second half of the verse (the *Silluk* half). In the great majority of cases, however (in the Psalms ten times to once), the compass of the verse is such that *Athnach* suffices as principal disjunctive. The verse, however, may also be so comparatively short that disjunctives of less value may be used. The selection of the principal disjunctive is determined by the number of single or makkephated words counting backwards from the *Silluk*-word, the latter not being reckoned. The selection is made in the following manner:—(1) If the sixth word, or one still further removed from the *Silluk*-word, admits of a disjunctive, *Olewejored* is used (*e.g.* i. 1, by the eighth word). (2) If the fifth word, in about four cases out of five *Olewejored* is likewise used (*e.g.* iv. 5), in the remaining cases, however, *Athnach*. (3) If the fourth word, in about ten cases out of eleven *Athnach* is used (*e.g.* i. 4, ii. 6). (4) If the third word, *Athnach* is likewise used (*e.g.* i. 5, 6, lxiii. 1, 3). (5) If the second word, *Athnach* is used (*e.g.* ii. 1, iv. 6); under certain circumstances, however, it is transformed into *Rebia mugrasch* (*e.g.* lxiii. 4, lvii. 9: אעירה שָׁחַר with *Mugrasch* preceding). (6) If the first word, *Rebia mugrasch* always appears instead of *Athnach* (*e.g.* xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 24); such a case, however, is comparatively rare; in the great majority of cases, seeing that the rhythmic interest preponderates over the logical, the verse is divided by *Athnach* at a word at some distance from *Silluk* (*e.g.* cxix. 20: לתאבָה). (7) If the verse consists of only three words, *Rebia mugrasch* is

transformed into *Munach* (*e.g.* xxxviii. 1; xlviii. 1 is the only exception). (8) If the first word of the verse should have the chief logical disjunctive, *Azla legarmeh* is used instead of *Olewejored* (*e.g.* xxvi. 1: לדוד), and *Pazer* instead of *Athnach* (*e.g.* xviii. 2: ויאמר; cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 2: ויאמר) the place of the latter being taken by *Rebia mugrasch*, if this initial word is followed by two others (*e.g.* xiii. 5: למנצח מזמור לדוד). In order not to go astray, the exegete must also know the rules, in accordance with which a conjunctive accent has occasionally the value of a disjunctive; for instances occur in which, where *Rebia mugrasch* (*e.g.* civ. 32) or *Dechi* (*e.g.* cxix. 25) are required, they are for rhythmical reasons transformed into conjunctives, in such a way, it is true, that no great violence is done thereby to the logical interpunction.[1]

VIII. The Versions of the Psalms.

The earliest version of the Psalms is the Alexandrian Greek. When the grandson of the son of Sirach came to Egypt in the year 132 B.C., not only the Law and the Prophets but also the Hagiographa were already translated into Greek, and therefore certainly also the Psalms, after which the Hagiographa are directly named in Luke xxiv. 44. In its original form the legend of the LXX. (LXXII.) translators refers only to the Thôra; the translation of the other books is later, and by different authors. All these had before them a text consisting only of consonants, which were, moreover, here and there somewhat indistinct. This text of theirs, which had a great variety of glosses, was not yet definitely established, as it was later by the Masoretes; and having no idea of the higher expository and artistic function

[1] The above rules are taken from the learned and instructive *Treatise on the Accentuation of the three so-called poetical books* by Prof. William Wickes (Oxford, 1881). The principal matter contained in them is to be found already in Baer, *Accentuationssystem*, p. 505 (in the chap. *Alternirende Trenner*.)

of the translator, they rendered it literally, and frequently with no real comprehension of the meaning of their rendering themselves. From Philo, Josephus and the New Testament we see that, notwithstanding the swarm of various readings contained in the MSS., the text of this version lies before us, on the whole, in its original form; so that criticism, which, since the middle of the last century, has come into the possession of many means of assistance hitherto unknown, and more especially in the province of the Psalms,[1]

[1] Foremost among these stand the Codex Sinaiticus and the text of the Codex Vaticanus, with the latter of which we have recently been made far better acquainted by means of the facsimile edition commenced by Vercellone and Cozza in 1866 and now completed. The collation of these two MSS., the text of the Sixtine edition of 1586 being taken as the basis, is found in Eberhard Nestle's exceedingly valuable *Appendix* to the sixth edition of Tischendorf's Septuagint (1880). In addition to these two MSS., S and B, there have to be taken into account for the criticism of the text (1) the *Psalterium Veronense*, edited by Blanchini in 1740, a Greek text written in Roman characters, with the Itala alongside of it, belonging to the fifth or sixth century (*vid.* Tischendorf's edition of the LXX., 1869, *Prolegg.*, p. lviii. *f.*); (2) The *Psalterium Turicense purpureum*, described by Breitinger in 1748, a Greek text, likewise belonging to the fifth or sixth century (*ut supra*, p. iix. *f.*); (3) *Psalmorum Fragmenta papyracea Londinensia* (in the British Museum), containing Pss. x. 2–xviii. 6, xx. 14–xxxiv. 6, belonging to the fourth century, and printed in Tischendorf's *Monumenta Sacra Inedita. Nova Collectio*, t. i.; (4) *Fragmenta Psalmorum Tischendorfiana*, embracing Pss. cxli. (ii.), 7–8, cxlii. (iii.), 1–3, cxliv. (v.), 7–13, belonging to the fifth or fourth century, in the *Monumenta*, t. ii. Cf. *Prolegg.* to LXX. (1869), p. lx. *f.* As yet no use has been made of the following: (1) the *Psalterium Græco-Latinum* in the library of the monastery of St. Gall, *Cod.* 17 in 4to, a Greek text in uncials with the Latin alongside of it; (2) the *Psalterium Gallico-Romano-Hebraico-Græcum*, of the year 909, *Cod.* 230 of the public library in Bamberg (*vid.* the description of it by Schönfelder in the *Serapeum*, 1865, No. 21, and in Hamann's *Canticum Moysi ex Psalterio quadruplici Salomonis III. Episcopi Constantiensis etc.* 1874), written by Solomon, abbot of St. Gall and bishop of Constance (*d.* 920), and brought to Bamberg by the Emperor Henry II. (*d.* 1024), who had received it as a present in St. Gall. For the textual criticism of the LXX. this latter codex is of equal importance with the similar Veronense.

will not be able to reverse the judgment which has been pronounced regarding the character of the work. Nevertheless, this version, as being the oldest key to the understanding of the language in which the books of the Old Testament were written, as being the oldest mirror of the text of the Old Testament, a text which is not to be exempted from sober criticism, and as being our most important means of controlling the interpretation of Scripture transmitted in the Talmud, the Midrasch, and, speaking generally, the national literature composed outside of Egypt, is of inestimable value. Looked at from another point of view, it lays claim to still greater significance. Next to the Book of Isaiah, no book is so frequently quoted in the New Testament as the Psalter. The Epistle to the Hebrews has grown entirely from the roots of expressions found in the Old Testament Psalms. The Apocalypse, the only book which did not admit of formal references to the past, is nevertheless not without allusions to the Psalter: Psalm ii. in particular has contributed largely to the moulding of the apocalyptic view and language. With few exceptions (such as John xiii. 18) these New Testament quotations follow the LXX., and that too even where it is only in a general kind of way that this translation correctly reproduces the meaning of the original (*e.g.* Pss. xix. 5, li. 6, cxvi. 10). The explanation of this use of the LXX. in the New Testament is the high esteem in which this version was held among the Jews; not only by the Hellenistic, but also by the Palestinian Jews, it was regarded as a providential and almost miraculous literary production, so that the Psalms, *e.g.*, which were used by the Christian Churches of Palestine, were translated, not directly from the original text, but from it.[1] This high estimation of the LXX. was justified by the fact that, though far inferior to the canonical Scriptures, it never-

[1] *Vid.* my lecture on the Palestinian dialect in *Daheim*, 1874, p. 428.

theless takes an epochmaking place in the history of divine revelation. For it was the first proclamation to the Gentile world of the Old Testament revelation, and therefore the first introduction of Japhet into the tents of Shem. With it there was also at the same time taken a decisive step towards the removal of the Old Testament particularism. The Alexandrian version was, therefore, an event that paved the way for Christianity, in which the destiny of the religion of Israel to become the religion of the world is fulfilled. It has created beforehand the language in which Christianity was to speak; for the New Testament Scriptures are composed in the common Greek dialect (κοινή) with an Alexandrian colouring. Speaking generally, Alexandrianism has coined beforehand the forms, which Christianity was to fill with religious and saving contents. Just as the way of Jesus the Christ passed over Egypt (Matt. ii. 15), so the way of Christianity has also passed over that country, and more especially over Alexandria.

The Targum, or Chaldee version of the Psalms, a version which becomes paraphrastic only in a few passages, where reference is made to Midrasch interpretations, is equally venerable on account of its antiquity and independence, although it is not of such significance for the history of redemption as the LXX. Although in Ps. cviii. 11 (following, it would seem, an earlier text) it draws a parallel between Rome and Constantinople (a parallel which could have been drawn at the earliest in the fourth century), and in Ps. lxxxiii. 7 rendering הגרים by הוננראי (which was hardly possible previous to the ninth), and, therefore, in its present form later than the Peschito, this Psalm-Targum, nevertheless, undoubtedly belongs to a much earlier period; for even during the existence of the temple there was already a written Targum to the Book of Job.[1] It belongs to the

[1] *Vid. Tosefta* to *Schabb.*, c. 14; *jer. Schabb.*, xvi. 1; *bab. Schabb.*, 115 *a*; *Sofrim*, 5, 15.

group of so-called Jerusalem Targums;[1] for although (as the Jerusalem Talmud shows) the Aramaic idiom, in which it is written, differs not a little, as being a book-language, from the dialect spoken in Palestine,[2] it resembles the latter in that it heaps up Greek words (such as אַנְגְּלִין ἄγγελοι, אַכְסַדְרִין ἐξέδραι, קִירִיס κύριος) and like it approximates to Syriac both in sound and structure. From this version, which surpasses the LXX. in respect of grammatical accuracy, and already presupposes a more definitely established and authoritative text, we become acquainted with the interpretation of the Psalms that was current in the Synagogue, in the form in which, under the influence of old tradition, it had become fixed during the first Christian centuries.[3] Even yet the text of the Targum is in a very wretched condition. It is to be found most correctly in Buxtorf's *Biblia magna*, and unpunctuated in de Lagarde's *Hagiographa Chaldaice*, 1873. The treatise עוטה אור of Benzion Berkowitz (Wilna, 1843) gives critical notes on the Targums of the Hagiographa.

The Peschito (ܦܫܝܛܬܐ a simple translation, reproducing the sense פְּשַׁט), the old version of the Syrian Church, which was made not later than the second or third century, is the third most important translation of the Psalms. Its author translates from the original text, which he has before him in an unpunctuated and perhaps also far from correct form; we may learn this from such errors as xvii. 15 (אמונתך instead of תמונתך), lxxxiii. 12 (שִׂדמו ואבדמו, *dele eos et perde eos*, instead of שִׂיתמו נדיבמו), and cxxxix. 16 (גמלי, *retributionem meam*, instead of גלמי). In other errors he is influenced by the LXX., as in lvi. 9 (כנגדך, LXX. ἐνώπιόν σου, instead of בנאדך). In such deviations from the better text he occasionally

[1] *Vid.* Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebers. der Bibel*, p. 166 *f.*

Syriac Psalm-titles (Cod. Ambros. and Wright, No. 169) speak of a Psalm text in the "Palestinian" dialect (cf. *D. M. Z.*, xxv. 268).

[3] *Vid.* the remarks on the Psalm-Targum by David Oppenheim in the periodical *Hamaggid*, 1876, Nos. 13 *ff.*

follows this version not without an attempt at improvement, as in xc. 5 (*generationes eorum annus erunt*, i.e. זרעותיו שנה יהיו, LXX. *τὰ ἐξουδενώματα αὐτῶν ἔτη ἔσονται*,), in cx. 3 (*populus tuus gloriosus*, i.e. נְדִבוּת in the sense of נדיבה, Job xxx. 15, nobility, rank, LXX. *μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχή*.) In xii. 6 he coincides remarkably with the *τάξω σωτήριον ἐμφανές* of Symmachus. It is evident that he has before him not only the original text, but also the LXX.; and this fact cannot be got rid of by the assumption that the text of the Peschito has been greatly corrupted by means of emendations from the later Hexaplarian translation. All the same this supposition is by no means improbable; for the LXX. came to be held in such universal esteem in the Church, that the Syrians were almost ashamed of their old version, which deviated from it in many respects; and it was this circumstance that furnished the occasion in the year 617 for the making of a new Syriac version from the Hexaplarian text of the LXX. Not only, however, between the Peschito and the LXX., but also between the Peschito and the Targum, there exists a by no means accidental reciprocal relationship, which shows itself at once in Ps. i. (e.g. in the translation of לצים by ממיקני and of תורה by נמוסא), and which hardly admits of being explained on any other assumption than that, as in the case of the Book of Proverbs, the Christian Peschito was used by the Jewish targumists, or even conversely.[1] It is evident from such passages as xix. 5, lxviii. 19 (cf. Eph. iv. 8 and Heb. viii. 8 with Jerem. xxxi. 31) and cx. 3, that the Syriac translator was a Christian; that he was a Jewish Christian is shown by his knowledge of Hebrew, with which there was combined also a knowledge of Greek; for in those days the intellectual commerce of the nations em-

[1] From a later period it is related that, when Haja Gaon (in Babylon) stumbled upon a difficult passage in the course of his academical lectures on the Psalms, he enquired of the Catholicus how he had learned to explain it. *Vid* Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 125 *f*.

braced within the Roman empire was carried on by means of Greek. Moreover this version has also its own peculiar targumistic manner; it turns tropical expressions into literal, and, with singular consistency, interrogative clauses into direct assertions; in Ps. lxxviii. 11–13, this is done with a most outrageous perversion of the true sense into its very opposite. In general the author shuns no violence in order to import a fitting meaning into difficult passages (e.g. in xii. 6*b*; lx. 6). The musical and historical titles, and, therefore, for the most part also the סלה (including הגיון סלה, ix. 17), and even the הללויה of the Hallelujah Psalms he leaves untranslated, and his verses (*pethgome*) do not coincide with the Masoretic. For the criticism of the text this version is inferior to the LXX. There was also a translation of the Psalms into the Palestinian Aramaic. Land has published fragments of this version in the fourth volume of his *Anecdota*. From some statements found in Syriac MSS., that the Psalms were first of all translated out of the Palestinian, one might suppose that the Syriac translator does not directly follow the LXX., but through the medium of that Palestinian version, which slavishly follows the LXX.; but according to Baethgen's investigation of the subject this is a supposition that is not confirmed. The oldest MS. of the Peschito is that of the Ambrosiana, dating from the 6th century, and edited in photolithographic facsimile by Antonio Maria Ceriani. Eberhard Nestle has incorporated this text of the Milan MS. according to Ceriani's edition in his *Psalterium Tetraglottum* (Greek, Syriac, Chaldee, Latin), which was dedicated to the university of Tübingen on the occasion of the celebration of its fourth centenary (1877).[1] The separate edition of the Syriac Psalms by Dathe (1768) takes

[1] For further information, cf. Friedr. Baethgen, *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschita:* Kiel, Schwers, 1878. *Vid.* also his first article on the value of the early versions of the Psalms for the criticism of the text referred to further on (p. 61).

the text of Erpenius as its basis, to which it adds valuable notes.

New Greek translations were also made in the second century. When the rupture between the Synagogue and the Church took place, the high esteem which the LXX. had hitherto enjoyed, was changed into the opposite, so that they no longer compared the day when this version was completed, to the day of the giving of the law, but to the day of the golden calf. Nor could its defects possibly fail to become more and more perceptible; even the writers of the New Testament found it here and there in need of correction or altogether unfit to be used; for even as early as their day, the transmitted text of the Old Testament was substantially the same as that which has been masoretically fixed since the sixth century, not only as regards the consonants, but also as regards the pronunciation. Accordingly Aquila of Pontus, a heathen who had become a proselyte to Judaism, composed, in the first half of the second century, a Greek translation of the Old Testament, which, even at the risk of falling into an un-Greek mode of expression, imitated the original, word for word, and allowed itself to be determined in its choice of a Greek term by the etymology of the Hebrew. In order not to efface a single one of the weighty words, he translates the first sentence of the Thôra: Ἐν *κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς σὺν* (את) *τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν* (את) *τὴν γῆν*. In the fragments of his translation of the Psalms, one of which has been preserved in the Talmudic literature (*vid.* on xlviii. 15), we do not meet with instances of such violence in favour of literalness, although even there he constrains the Greek to assume a Hebrew form, and everywhere renders the words in accordance with their primary meaning (*e.g.* דביר, *χρηματιστήριον*; מגלה, *εἴλημα*; פתח, *ἄνοιγμα*; רהב, *ὅρμημα*; אמן, *πεπιστευμένως*), sometimes unhappily and led astray by the *usus loquendi* of his time. In a few passages he reads the text differently from the vocalized text we now possess (*e.g.* x. 4, *ὅταν ὑψωθῇ*);

as for the rest, however, he follows tradition (*e.g.* סלה, *ἀεί*; שדי, *ἱκανός*; מכתם, *τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἁπλοῦ*, = מך ותם); nor does he despise whatever of value is offered by the LXX. (*e.g.* במנים, *ἐν χορδαῖς*); indeed, speaking generally, his translation, although independent, is based upon the epoch-making pioneer work of the LXX. His talent as a translator is unmistakable. He is well versed in Hebrew, and a perfect master of Greek; *e.g.* he is never at a loss to find the one Greek word that answers to the causative forms (הפיל, *πτωματίζειν*; הריץ, *δρομοῦν*; השכיל, *ἐπιστημοῦν*, and the like). That he translated for the Synagogue in opposition to the Church is betrayed by such passages as ii. 12, xxii. 17, cx. 3, and perhaps also by lxxxiv. 10 (cf. Dan. ix. 26), where he prefers *ἠλειμμένου* to *χριστοῦ*; although even in this respect we must not assert that he was influenced throughout by an evil intention. Even Jerome on calmer reflection toned down his indignation against Aquila's translation to the milder judgment: *ut amicæ menti fatear, quæ ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam plura reperio*, and even praises it, as compared with the translations of Theodotion and Symmachus, in the following terms: *Isti Semichristiani Judaice transtulerunt, et Judæus Aquila interpretatus est ut Christianus.*

The translation of Theodotion is not an original work; it follows the LXX., and, with the assistance of the translation of Aquila, brings this version, which had still the widest circulation, nearer the original; the fragments possessed by us of independently translated passages contain nothing specially characteristic. Symmachus also takes the LXX. as his basis; in bringing it, however, into conformity with the original, he proceeds much more thoroughly and independently than Theodotion; he distinguished himself also from Aquila by endeavouring to combine literalness with perspicuity and grammatical accuracy; his translation of the Psalms has even a vein of poetry. Both Aquila and Symmachus have edited their translations twice, so that a

few passages (*vid.* cx. 3) are extant translated in a twofold form. Besides the LXX., Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, there were also a fifth, a sixth, and a seventh Greek version of the Psalms. *Quinta* is said to have been found in Jericho during the reign of the emperor Caracalla, *Sexta* in Nicopolis during that of Alexander Mamäas. The remains of the former betray an acquaintance with the language and with tradition; the latter occasionally becomes paraphrastic (xxxvii. 35; Hab. iii. 13). A *Septima* which is also occasionally mentioned is for the most part like Theodotion. In the Hexapla of Origen, which strictly speaking contained only six columns (a Hebrew text, a Hebrew text written in Greek characters, Aq., Symm., LXX., Theod.), *Quinta* (E) *Sexta* (ϛ), and *Septima* (Z) formed additional columns in the Psalms and elsewhere: apart altogether from *Septima*, the Hexapla thus became the Octapla. The remains of these old versions, which were thus placed together by Origen, were first edited by Nobilius and Drusius; the most complete editions, however, are those of Bernard de Montfaucon (*Hexaplorum Origenis quæ supersunt*, 2 vols. *folio*, Paris, 1713) and of Fred. Field (*Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt*, 2 vols. in 4to, Oxford, 1875), the latter much enriched by materials found in recently discovered sources.

Besides the LXX., Aq., Symm., Theod., V., and VI., Euthymius Zigadenus mentions as a seventh translation that of Lucian, which attempted to restore the original text of the Septuagint by comparing it with the Hebrew. This Lucian died (311) as a martyr in Nicomedia, whither he had been dragged from Antioch. The autograph of his translation was found in Nicomedia, hidden in a small lime-plastered tower.[1] We are no more able to form an accurate idea of this recension of the Septuagint by Lucian than of that of

[1] Cf. the Athanasian Synopsis in Montfaucon, *Hexapla*, t. i. p. 59, and the communication from a Syriac MS. in the *Repertorium für Bibl. und Morgenl. Lit.*, *ib.* (1784) p. 48*f.*

the contemporary Egyptian bishop Hesychius, since not even specimens of either have been preserved to us. It would be interesting to know the difference between the procedure of these two critics and that of Origen, who corrected the text of the κοινή in conformity with the Hebrew original by means of Theodotion's, *obelis jugulans quæ abundare videbantur, et quæ deerant sub asteriscis interserens*, a method which has occasioned a confusion that might easily have been foreseen.

Of the Old Latin version that derived from the LXX., the so-called *Itala*, we possess the Psalter complete. Blanchini has published this version of the Psalms (1740) from the *Psalterium Veronense*, and Sabbatier (in t. ii. of his *Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ*, 1751) from the *Psalterium* of the monastery of St. Germain. The text in Faber Stapulensis' *Quincuplex Psalterium* (1509) is compiled from Augustine; for Augustine, like Hilary, Ambrose, Prosper, and Cassiodore, expounds the Psalms according to the Old Latin text. In the course of time this text had lost so much both in respect of correctness and uniformity, that Damasus, bishop of Rome, induced Jerome, whom he esteemed very highly, to subject it to a thorough revision and to construct a normal text for Latin Christendom. Jerome began in the year 383 with the four Gospels, and also completed the Psalter in the same year:—this first revised Psalm text is the *Psalterium Romanum*, individual passages of which (set to music) are still extant in the Missal and the Breviary.[1] He afterwards, when living in Bethlehem, prepared a second more carefully revised edition according to the Hexaplarian text of the Septuagint,[2] with daggers (as a sign of additions found in

[1] On this subject see the review of the third edition of my Commentary on the Psalms in the *Theol. Literaturblatt* (1874, No. 19), where Reusch correctly states the relation subsisting between the liturgy of the mass and the Breviary to the *Ps. romanum.*

[2] *Illud breviter admoneo*—says Jerome, *ep.* cvi. *ad Sunniam et Frete-*

the LXX. contrary to the original) and asterisks (a sign of additions made to the LXX. from Theodotion in accordance with the original), and this second edition, which the Gallican Churches were the first to adopt, received the name of the *Psalterium Gallicanum*. It is substantially the same as the Psalter of the Vulgate, and was published with its critical signs from a MS. of Bruno, bishop of Würzburg (*d.* 1045), for the first time in the year 1494 (afterwards edited by Cochleus, 1533); both Psalters, the Roman and the Gallican, are placed opposite one another in Faber's *Quincuplex Psalterium*, as well as in t. x. p. 1 of the *Opp. Hieronymi, ed. Vallarsi*, and elsewhere.

Like the Syro-Hexaplarian and the other oriental daughters of the LXX. and the Peschito, these Latin Psalters, the translation of which was made from the common or from the Hexaplarian text of the Septuagint, have only an indirect value for the history of exegesis. On the other hand, Jerome's version of the Psalter *juxta Hebraicam veritatem* is the first scientific work of the kind; like the whole of his independent translation of the Old Testament from the original text, it is a bold deed, from the performance of which he did not suffer himself to be deterred by the loud outcry that was raised against such an innovation, and by means of which he has rendered an invaluable service to the Church. This independent translation of Jerome has become the Vulgate of the Church. The text of the Vulgate, however, is in many respects different from what it was originally; nor does it include Jerome's Psalter, in the independent translation of which he consulted not only the Hebrew original, but also the later Greek versions, more especially Aquila and

lam—ut sciatis, aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Cæsareensis Eusebius omnesque Græciæ tractatores κοινήν, id est, Communem appellant atque Vulgatam et a plerisque nunc Λουκιανός dicitur; aliam Septuaginta Interpretum, quæ in Ἑξαπλοῖς codicibus reperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est et Hierosolymæ atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur.

Symmachus, and into which he here and there adopted passages out of the *Ps. Gallicanum* that did not stand in need of correction. On the whole, however, he seeks here, as well as in his translation of the other books of the Old Testament, to reproduce the *Hebræa veritas*. Nevertheless the inflexible liturgical use of the Psalter in the Church stood in the way of the critical adoption of this new translation of it; the texts of the *Psalterium Romanum* and *Gallicanum* held their ground, and that of the latter (with the omission of the critical signs) became an integral portion of the Vulgate. It was so much the more desirable that Jerome's Latin Psalter *ex Hebræo* (*Opp. ed. Vallarsi*, t. ix. p. iii.) should be made more generally known and accessible by means of a separate critical edition. The Hebræo-Latin Psalterium edited by Tischendorf, Baer, and myself (Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1874) gives the original text, and, opposite to it, the translation of Jerome according to the text of Vallarsi's edition of his works, along with the different readings of the Florentine Cod. Amiatinus according to Theod. Heyse's collation—a collation which is certainly by no means satisfactory, but which has not yet been replaced by another. De Lagarde's *Psalterium juxta Hebræos Hieronymi*, 1874,[1] supplies a new critical recension of the text according to MSS. and earlier editions.[2]

[1] *Vid.* the instructive review of these two editions, especially of the more independent one of Lagarde, by Reusch in the *Theolog. Literaturblatt*, 1874, No. 20. On the LXX., the Syriac, Jerome and the Targum, *vid.* the instructive first article of Baethgen, "*Der text-kritische Wert der alten Uebersetzungen zu den Psalmen*" in pp. 405–459 of the *Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie* for the year 1882. The second article, in the last number for the same year, pp. 593–667, contains a full collation of the versions treated of in the first article, as well as of Aquila's and the other later Greek versions—a preliminary labour of the very greatest service to the exegete.

[2] Fried. Baethgen (in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1881, pp. 105–112) gives an account of a Hamburg MS. of the *Psalterium Hieronymi juxta Hebræos*, which has not been used by de Lagarde.

Origen and Jerome learned the language of the Old Testament from Jewish teachers. What the scholarship of Origen was able to accomplish has almost entirely perished with his Hexapla, that gigantic *Bibelwerk*, which, if it were still extant, would be the oldest direct monument of the text of the Old Testament. On the other hand, there has been preserved to us in Jerome's translation of the Old Testament from the original text (*canon Hebraicæ veritatis*) the ripest fruit of the erudition of this investigator, who was inspired by an unwearied and resolute scientific zeal. It is a work of the greatest critical value, both as regards the history of the language and of exegesis. The translation of the Psalter is dedicated to Sophronius, who had promised to render it into Greek; but this Greek translation is not extant.

Neither in the Synagogue nor in the Church has Jerome's translation of the Psalter its equal till the time of Saadia Gaon of Fajum, the Arabian expositor of the Psalms. Two MSS. of his translation of the Psalms are to be found in Oxford; the most valuable, however, which also contains his exposition of them in a complete form, is in Munich. In 1791 Schnurrer contributed Pss. xvi., xl., and cx. in Eichhorn's *Biblioth. der bibl. Lit.*, vol. iii., from *Cod. Pocock.* 281; in 1840 Haneberg communicated Ps. lxviii. and many other separate passages from the Munich Cod.; Ewald gave the most copious excerpts from *Cod. Pocock.* 281 and *Cod. Huntingt.* 416 (with appended various readings from *Cod. Mon.*) in vol. i. of the *Beiträge zur ältesten Ausl. und Sprach-erklärung des A.T.* (1844). The gain which the comprehension of the Psalms, as determined by the demands of the present day, can derive from Saadia, is exceedingly little; so much the more interesting, however, is the rich spoil that he yields to philology and the history of exegesis. Saadia stands in the middle of the still mysterious process of growth, of which the finally established punctuated text of the Old Testament is the outcome; he has written a

treatise on punctuation (ניקוד), to which Raschi (on Ps. xlv. 10) refers; in his treatment of the Old Testament text, however, he shows himself still unfettered by its fixation by means of the vowel points. His translation is the first scientific work on the Psalms in the Synagogue. Jerome's translation is older by five centuries; but Luther's was the first to be entitled to stand side by side with it, and that because he for the first time drew once more from the source of the original text.

The problem which is presented to the translator of the sacred Scriptures was recognised by Luther as by no one before him, and solved by him as by no one since. What Cicero says of his translation of the two controversial speeches of Demosthenes and Æschines: *Non converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis iisdem et earum formis tanquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis: in quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omnium verborum vimque servavi; non enim ea me adnumerare lectori putavi oportere, sed tanquam adpendere*, applies also to Luther: he has thought, felt and lived himself into the original, in order not to render it literally and with a slavish adherence to its form, but, while preserving its spirit, to cast it freely and, in the deepest sense, faithfully, into true and yet spiritually renewed German. This applies especially to his translation of the Psalms, which even Moses Mendelssohn has found it good to follow. That it can be improved here and there by a better comprehension of the meaning and, in general, by greater fidelity, and that too without doing any violence to the spirit of the German language,—to deny this would be ungrateful blindness to the progress in the knowledge of the Scripture, which is not merely promised, but which is being actually accomplished before our own eyes. The work of Dr. K. F. Schröder: *Die Psalmen nach der deutschen Uebersetzung D. Martin Luthers in revidirtem Text* (Halle, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses*, 1876), published at the in-

stigation of the conference intrusted with the revision of the translation of the Old Testament, furnishes an actual evidence of this, and that too, as we hope, in a manner which is well considered and faithful to the spirit of Luther.

IX. History of the Exposition of the Psalms.

If now we proceed to take a general survey of the history of the exposition of the Psalms, it will be manifest how late it was till the task of scientific exegesis was recognised. We begin with the Apostolic interpretation. The Old Testament is essentially Christo-centric. Therefore the innermost truth of the Old Testament has been brought to the light in the revelation of Jesus Christ. Not all at once, however; the Passion, the Resurrection and the Ascension are three stages in this gradual opening up of the Old Testament and more especially of the Psalms. Both before and after His resurrection our Lord Himself opened up the meaning of the Psalms by applying them to His own person and lot; He showed how in Him was fulfilled what was written in the law of Moses, in the Prophets and the Psalms; He revealed to His disciples the way of understanding the Scriptures (Luke xxiv. 44 *f.*). Our Lord's interpretation of the Psalms is at once the starting-point and the goal of Christian interpretation of them. The latter commences as an interpretation of them by the Church, and indeed primarily as that of the Apostles, on the day of Pentecost, upon which day the Spirit, whose organ David in his last words (2 Sam. xxiii. 2) confesses himself to have been, descended upon the Apostles as the Spirit of Jesus, the fulfiller and the fulfilment of prophecy. This Spirit of the Glorified One completed what He, in the days of His humiliation and after His resurrection, had begun; it opened up to the disciples the meaning of the Psalms. With what predilection they turned to these, we may gather from the

fact that they are cited some seventy times in the New Testament,—next to Isaiah, the most frequently of all the books of the Old Testament. From these disclosures regarding the Psalms the Church will have to draw even to the end of time. For only the end will be equal to the beginning and even surpass it. We must not, however, seek in the New Testament what it does not profess to offer, an answer, viz., to the questions of lower science, of grammar, contemporary history, and criticism. The highest and final questions relating to the spiritual meaning of Scripture find here an answer; it was left to the following age to provide the grammatico-historico-critical substructure, the candelabrum, as it were, of the new light.

The POST-APOSTOLIC PATRISTIC interpretation was incapable of performing this task. With the exception of Origen and Jerome, the expositors of the early Church possessed no knowledge of Hebrew; and even these two did not possess enough to enable them to emancipate themselves entirely from the dependence upon the LXX. that only too frequently led them astray. Of Origen's commentary and homilies on the Psalms we possess only fragments translated by Rufinus and his ὑπόμνημα εἰς τοὺς ψαλμούς (issued in a complete form by Kleopas in 1855 from a MS. found in the monastery of Mar-Saba). Jerome, it is true, makes mention (*contra Rufinum*, i. § 19) of *commentarioli* on the Psalms written by himself; but the *Breviarium in Psalterium* (in t. vii. p. ii. of the *opp. ed. Vallarsi*) that is extant under his name is acknowledged to be spurious, and is of no value whatever either as regards the language or the history of the text. The almost complete commentary of Eusebius (on Pss. i.–cxix., according to the Hebrew reckoning) which was made known by Montfaucon (*Collectio nova Patrum et Scriptorum Græc.*, t. i.) is not liable to suspicion. Although living in Palestine and with the advantage of a rich library, Eusebius is so ignorant of Hebrew, that he considers it possible that

Μαριαμ (מרחם) in Ps. cx. may refer to Mary; by means, however, of excerpts from the Hexapla he imparts much welcome information bearing upon the history of the various translations; in other respects the value of his work is but very trifling, for the exposition is superficial and allegorising in an arbitrary and diffuse manner. Athanasius, in his concise exposition of the Psalms (in t. i. p. ii. of the Benedictine edition), is wholly dependent upon Philo for the explanation that he gives of Hebrew names and words. His letter: πρὸς Μαρκελλῖνον εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τῶν ψαλμῶν (in the same volume of the Benedictine edition) is an exceedingly beautiful work; it treats of the rich contents of the Psalms, classifies them according to several different points of view, and gives advice as to the way in which one should use them in the manifold situations and moods of one's outer and inner life. John Reuchlin has translated this booklet of Athanasius into Latin, and Jörg Spalatin has rendered Reuchlin's Latin into German (1516, 4to). Gregory of Nyssa's two books, εἰς τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τῶν ψαλμῶν (*Opp. ed. Paris.*, t. i.) are similar to this letter of Athanasius. They treat of the arrangement and the titles of the Psalms; as regards the latter, however, he is so far misled by the LXX., as to account for the absence in the original text of titles in the case of twelve Psalms that have titles in it (this is the number according to Gregory) by bringing a charge of ἀπιστία and κακία against the Jews. Nevertheless many a valuable remark is to be found in this introduction to the Psalter by the great Nyssene. Much about the same time as Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers, taking Origen as his model, wrote in the Western Church his allegorising *tractatus in librum Psalmorum*, with an elaborate prologue, which reminds us strongly of that of Hippolytus. We have still his exposition of Pss. i., ii., ix., xiii., xiv., li., lii., liii.–lxix., xci., cxviii.–cl. (according to the numbering in the LXX.), transferred according to Jerome (*ep. ad. Augustin.* cxii.)[1]

[1] The following Greek expositors of the Psalter are named there: (1)

from Origen and Eusebius, but ingenious and pithy from first to last, though of more value to the dogmatic theologian than to the exegete (t. xxvii., xxviii. of the *Collectio Patrum* by Caillau and Guillon).[1] Ambrose's *Enarrationes in Pss.* i. xxxv.–xl., xliii., xlv., xlvii., xlviii., lxi., cxviii. (in t. ii. of the Benedictine edition) were published somewhat later, but still during the two last decades of the fourth century (about 386–397). The exposition of Ps. i. is at the same time also an introduction to the whole Psalter, and is taken partly from Basil. He and Ambrose have eulogised the Psalter in the most glowing terms: *Psalmus enim*—says the latter—*benedictio populi est, Dei laus, plebis laudatio, plausus omnium, sermo universorum, vox Ecclesiæ, fidei canora confessio, auctoritatis plena devotio, libertatis lætitia, clamor jucunditatis, lætitiæ resultatio. Ab iracundia mitigat, a sollicitudine abdicat, a mœrore allevat. Nocturna arma, diurna magisteria; scutum in timore, festum in sanctitate, imago tranquillitatis, pignus pacis atque concordiæ, citharæ modo ex diversis et disparibus vocibus unam exprimens cantilenam. Diei ortus psalmum resultat, psalmum resonat occasus.* After these and similar words of preface, one naturally expects to find great fervour and thoughtfulness in the exposition. These are not wanting; but they are not present to such an extent as they would

Origen; (2) Eusebius of Cæsarea; (3) Theodore of Heraclea (the *Anonymous* in Corderius' *Catena*); (4) Asterius of Scythopolis; (5) Apollinaris (Apolinarius) of Laodicea; (6) Didymus of Alexandria. Then the following Latin: (1) Hilary of Poictiers, who, according to Jerome, translated or rather worked up the homilies of Origen on the Psalms (Jerome himself says of him, *ep.* lvii. *ad Pammach.*: *captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris jure transposuit*); (2) Eusebius of Vercelli, translator of the Commentary on the Psalms of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and (3) Ambrose, who also partially follows Origen. There is still extant a Μετάφρασις τοῦ ψαλτῆρος διὰ στίχων ἡρωϊκῶν by Apollinaris the elder. He has also translated the Pentateuch and some other books of the Old Testament into heroic verse.

[1] *Vid.* the description given of this commentary in Reinkens' *Hilaris von Poitiers* (1864), pp. 291–308.

have been had Ambrose, whose style is as musical as that of Hilary is prosaic, elaborated these expositions, which he partly preached and partly dictated, with his own hand. The most comprehensive work of the early Church upon the Psalms was that of Chrysostom, written probably while he was still living in Antioch. We still possess only his exposition of fifty-eight or (including Pss. iii. and xli., which in their present form do not belong to this work) sixty Psalms (in t. v. of Montfaucon's edition). Photius and Suidas place this commentary on the Psalms in the highest rank among Chrysostom's works. It is composed in the form of sermons, the style is brilliant, its contents are ethical rather than dogmatic; the Hebrew text is occasionally quoted after Origen's Hexapla; the different Greek translations are frequently compared, but unfortunately generally without being named. There is little trace here of the renowned philologico-historical tendency of the school of Antioch. Theodoret (in t. i. p. ii. of the Halle edition) is the first who proposes to himself to observe the due mean between an extravagantly allegorising and an unspiritually historical method of interpretation (alluding probably to Theodore of Mopsuestia), and thus to a certain extent makes a beginning in distinguishing between the task of exegesis and that of practical application. This scientific commencement, however, which is rather of a gramatico-historical character, is still meagre and by no means independent. The question, *e.g.* whether all the Psalms are by David or not, is briefly decided in the affirmative with κρατείτω τῶν πλειόνων ἡ ψῆφος.[1] The diligent comparison of

[1] In the Talmud, R. Meir, *Pesachim*, 117 *a*, defends the view that David is the author of all the Psalms: כל תשבחות שבספר תהלים בולן דוד אמרן, whereas in *Bathra*, 14 *b*, ten collaborators are assumed: דוד כתב ספר תהלים על ידי עשרה זקנים, Ezra being one of them; *vid.* the Midrasch to Cant. iv. and Eccl. vii. 19. In the first of these two passages לתלפיות is explained as an emblematical name of the Psalter, ספר שאמרוהו לו פיות הרבה, the book of David, to which many a mouth has contributed. And yet there are two recent commentaries on the

the Greek translators by name is exceedingly thankworthy; but this expositor, like the Syrians generally, is wanting in the mystic depth, which elsewhere compensates for the lack of scientific insight. All this applies also to Euthymius Zigadenus (Zigabenus): his commentary on the Psalms (in Greek in t. iv. of the Venetian edition of the *Opp. Theophylacti*), written at the instigation of the emperor Alexius Comnenus, is simply a skilful compilation, in which a free use is made of the Psalm-*Catena* of the somewhat earlier Νικήτας Σερρῶν, a work which was likewise a compilation, and which is to be found, still unprinted, on Mt. Athos.[1] Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (in t. iv. of the Benedictine edition) are the Western counterpart to Chrysostom's Psalm-commentary. The psalmody in the Milanese Church had contributed much to Augustine's conversion. His love to the Lord was kindled still more by the reading of the Psalms, while he prepared himself in solitude for baptism. His commentary consists of sermons, which he himself partly wrote down and partly dictated; only the thirty-two *sermones* on Ps. cxviii. (cxix.), which he ventured to expound last of all, were not actually delivered. He nowhere bases his exposition upon the text of Jerome, but makes shift with the older Latin translation, the original text of which he tries to establish and here and there to amend in accordance with the LXX.; whereas Arnobius the semi-Pelagian, in his paraphrastic Africano-Latin commentary on the Psalms (first edition by Erasmus, *Basileæ Froben.*, 1522, who, like Trithemius, erroneously held the author to be the same person as the Apologist), no longer adopts the so-called Itala, but already uses the version of Jerome as his basis. This work

Psalms, viz. by Klauss (1832) and Randegger (1841), which are written to prove that the whole of the Psalms are Davidic.

[1] We owe this information to Nicodemus the Agiorite's modern Greek edition of Euthymius' commentary on the Psalms (2 vols. Constantinople, 1819–21, 4to). This edition also contains excerpts from the *Catena* of Nicetas of Serræ.

of Augustine, far superior to that of Chrysostom in respect of richness and depth of thought, has become the principal quarry of all further exposition of the Psalms in the Western Church. In his *Expositiones in omnes Psalmos* (in t. ii. of the Benedictine edition), Cassiodore draws largely from Augustine, yet not without independence. The contributions of the Greek Church to the exposition of the Psalms have, since Photius, been frequently treasured up in so-called Σειραί, *Catenæ*. That of Nicetas, archbishop of Serræ in Macedonia (about 1070), is still unprinted; one that extends only to Ps. l. was published in Venice in the year 1569, another, containing the whole Psalter, was published by Corderius in Antwerp, in the year 1643 (3 vols., from MSS. in Vienna and Munich); in 1601 Folckmann gave excerpts from the *Catena* of Nicetas of Heraclea, and Aloysius Lippomanus began a *Catena* from Greek and Latin expositors on a very large scale (one folio vol. on Pss. i.–x., *Romæ*, 1585). The defects from which the ancient exposition of the Psalms suffers are in general the same in the Greek and the Western expositors. To their want of acquaintance with the language of the original text there have also to be added their unmethodical and irregular mode of procedure, their arbitrary exaggeration of the predictive character of the Psalms (*e.g.* Tertullian, *de spectaculis*, looks upon the whole of Ps. i. as a prophecy regarding Joseph of Arimathea), their unhistorical way of looking at things, before which all differences between the two Testaments vanish, and their misleading predilection for allegorising. The Apostolic interpretation of the Psalms is not worked out; they simply adopt it, without endeavouring fully to comprehend it; they do not place the Psalms in the light of the New Testament fulfilment, but translate them without more ado into New Testament language and thoughts. But never has the Church been so rapturously imbued with the spirit of the Psalms, which it was unwearied in singing both by day and by night; it has never used them

with richer results, even to martyrdom, than at the time of which we are speaking. It was a common thing to know the "whole of David" by heart.[1] In the Syrian Church it was only upon this condition that an illiterate person could be admitted to the service of the altar. As one passed through the country, instead of secular national songs, one might hear Psalms resounding from the fields and vineyards. *Quocunque te verteris*, Jerome writes from the Holy Land to the widow of Marcellus, *arator stivam tenens Alleluja decantat, sudans messor psalmis se avocat et curva attendens vitem falce vinitor aliquid Davidicum canit. Hæc sunt in hac provincia carmina, hæ (ut vulgo dicitur) amatoriæ cantiones, hic pastorum sibilus, hæc arma culturæ.* The delights of a country life he recommends to Marcella in the following among other words: *Vere ager floribus pingitur et inter querulas aves Psalmi dulcius cantabuntur.* In Sidonius Apollinaris the singing of Psalms appears even in the mouths of the men who tow the ships; and the poet draws from this a beautiful exhortation to Christians as they are faring and wandering through this life:

Curvorum hinc chorus helciariorum
Responsantibus Alleluja ripis
Ad Christum levat amicum celeusma.
Sic, sic psallite, nauta et viator!

And how many martyrs defied all the tortures to which they were subjected with the singing of Psalms! What the Church of those days was not able to accomplish for the exposition of the Psalms by means of ink, it has accomplished for the preservation of their spirit by means of its blood. Practice was far ahead of theory.[2] These patristic works are patterns for all times of the true depth and

[1] *Vid.* Dietrich, *De Psalterii usu etc. in eccl. Syriaca*, p. 1.

[2] In addition to the work of Otto Strauss, which has been already mentioned, *vid.* Armknecht: *Die heil. Psalmodie oder der psalmodirende König David und die singende Urkirche* (1855), and *W. Von Gülick: Das Psalterium nach seinem Hauptinhalte in seiner wissensch. und prakt.*

spirituality that should characterize the expositor of the Psalms.

The exposition of the Church of the Middle Ages has produced nothing that has advanced in anything essential beyond that of the Fathers. Cassiodore is followed by two compilers, Haymo (*d.* 853) and Remigius of Auxerre (*d.* about 900), who are even less independent than himself. The commentary of the former, edited by Erasmus, was published in Freiburg in 1531, that of the latter appeared, first in Cologne in 1536, and afterwards in the *Bibl. maxima Lugdunensis*. The commentary of Petrus Lombardus (*d.* about 1160) is simply a catena from the earlier expositors from Jerome to Alcuin. Thomas Aquinas, who, however, has completed the exposition of only fifty-one Psalms, and Alexander of Hales, if the commentary published under his name (*Venet.*, 1496) is not rather to be ascribed to Cardinal Hugo, comment in a more independent manner. Besides these, Bonaventura (*d.* 1274) and Albertus Magnus (*d.* 1280) stand out prominently as expositors of the Psalms during the Middle Ages; and, towards the close of that period, Michael Ayguanus (about 1400), whose commentary has been frequently reprinted since its first publication (*Mediol.*, 1510). To know one of these expositors is to know almost the whole of them. The most that they offer is an echo of the Fathers. In consequence of their dependence upon the letter of the Vulgate, and, therefore, indirectly of the LXX., they only too frequently fall into wrong trains of thought. The *literalis sensus* is completely buried in *mysticæ intelligentiæ*. Without recognising any distinction between the two economies, they continue to translate the Psalms directly into the language and thoughts of the New Testament:

Bed. (a Catholic prize-essay, 1858), partly also Rudelbach's *Hymnologische Studien* in the *Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1855, 4, 1856, 2, and, with special reference to the singing of the penitential Psalms, Zöckler's *Gesch. des Askese* (1863), pp. 256–264.

Albertus Magnus, *e.g.* in his commentary (*Opp.*, t. vii.), proceeds upon the principle: *Constat, quod totus liber iste de Christo est*, and consequently without more ado expounds *Beatus vir* (Ps. i. 1) and the whole Psalm *de Christo et ejus corpore ecclesia*. But just as we find in the Fathers individual instances of deep penetration and individual flashes of genius of imperishable value, so the reading of the expositors we are now discussing, and more especially of the mystics, is not without its reward. Augustine remained the greatest authority on the exposition of the Psalms for the Middle Ages. It was from Augustine, possibly with the assistance of Cassiodore, that Notker Labeo (*d.* 1022), the monk of the monastery of St. Gall, drew the brief exposition which, verse by verse, accompanies his German translation of the Psalms, and which H. Hattemer (in vol. ii. of his "*Denkmahle des Mittelalters*") and Heinzel and Scherer (1876, after the old High German Bavarian recension in the Vienna MS.) have edited.[1] The above-mentioned Latin Psalter-catena of Bruno, bishop of Würzburg (*d.* 1045), is likewise compiled from Augustine and Cassiodore, and also from Jerome, Bede and Gregory. The Syriac exposition of the Psalms by Gregory Barhebræus (*d.* 1286), of which Tullberg and Koraen in Upsala (1842) and Schröter in Breslau (1857) have issued specimens, is of some importance only for the history of exegesis; but otherwise deviates in no respect from the mediæval method.

The exposition of the Synagogue during the Middle Ages is wanting in the knowledge of Christ, and therefore also in the fundamental condition requisite for the spiritual understanding of the Scriptures; but just as it is to the

[1] In the *Luth. Zeitschrift* for the year 1873, Prof. Freyer gave excerpts from a hitherto overlooked mediæval German exposition of the Psalms contained in a MS. belonging to the cloister-school of Ilfeld a/H. The MS. begins with Ps. vii., and extends, not without omissions, to cxlix. 6.

Jews that we owe the transmission of the Canon of the Old Testament, so it is to them also that we owe the transmission of the knowledge of Hebrew. So far the Jewish commentators furnish us with what the contemporary Christian expositors were not able to offer. The interpretations of passages in the Psalms that are interspersed in the Talmuds are for the most part unsound, arbitrary, and absurd. Even the Midrasch to the Psalms with the title שוחר טוב (*vid.* Zunz, *Vorträge*, pp. 266 *ff.*), and the Midrasch-catenæ with the title ילקוט, of which at present only ילקוט שמעוני (by Simeon Kara ha-Darschan), but not ילקוט מכירי (by Machir ben Abba-Mari), is known, contain far more that has nothing whatever to do with the subject than what is pertinent and of use to us; the exposition of the Psalms given in them is always subservient to the thoroughly practical aim of supplying the material for a stirring and edifying discourse. It was only when somewhere about the year 900 A.D. the Jews, under Syro-Arabian influence, began the study of scientific grammar, that the exposition and the application of Scripture also began to be disentangled from one another. At the head of this new period of Jewish exegesis stands Saadia Gaon (*d.* 941/2), from whose Arabic translation and exposition of the Psalms Haneberg (1841)[1] and Ewald (1844) have given excerpts.[2] The Karaites, Salmon ben Jerocham and Jefeth, both of whom have also expounded the Psalms, are violent opponents of Saadia; but Jefeth, whose commentary on the Psalms[3] has been made known in part by Bargés (1846 and 1861), neverthe-

[1] *Vid.* Fleischer's review of Haneberg's work in *das Gersdorf'sche Repertorium*, xxxiv. 481–485.

[2] The first part of the complete Arabic text with a German translation by Dr. S. H. Margulies was published at Breslau, 1884, by Preuss and Jünger.

[3] It lies in MS. partly in Paris and partly in St. Petersburg, having been brought from Egypt to the former place in 1841 by Munk, and to the latter by Tischendorf in 1853.

less already stands under the influence of grammar, which was brought by Saadia into honour as a science, but which Salmon utterly rejects. Raschi (*i.e.* Rabbi Salomo Isaäki) of Troyes (*d.* 1105) is the next great expositor of the Psalms. He has commented not only upon the whole of the Talmud (only a few sections, as *e.g.* the tractate *Maccoth*, excepted), but also upon the whole of the Old Testament (with the exception of the Books of Chronicles); and he has not only treasured up with pithy brevity the traditions that are interspersed in the Talmud and the Midrasch, but has also availed himself (especially in the Psalms) of every grammatico-lexical means of assistance that was then in existence. Aben-Ezra of Toledo (*d.* 1167) and David Kimchi of Narbonne (*d.* about 1250), are less dependent upon tradition, which had for the most part run into absurdities. The former is the more independent and ingenious of the two but is seldom happy in his peculiar conceits; the latter is more dependent upon others, but is endowed with more sense for what is simple and natural; he is, indeed, the most grammatico-historical of all the Jewish expositors. The commentary of Gecatilia (Mose ha-Cohen Chiquitilla), which was written in Arabic, is known to us only from quotations, more especially in Aben-Ezra. In later commentaries, such as those of Mose Alschêch (Venice, 1601) and Joel Schoëb (Salonica, 1569), the simplicity and elegance of the earlier expositors have degenerated into the most offensive scholasticism; the commentary of Obadia Sforno (*d.* in Bologna, 1550), the teacher of Reuchlin, also philosophizes too much, but is nevertheless at least brief and clear. Their knowledge of Hebrew gives to all these expositors a great advantage over their Christian contemporaries; but the veil of Moses is in their case so much the thicker in proportion as their opposition to Christianity is the more conscious. Nevertheless the Church has not left these preparatory labours unused. In this respect the Jewish Chris-

tians, Nicolaus de Lyra (*d.* about 1340), the author of the *Postillæ perpetuæ*, and Paul de Santa Maria, archbishop of Burgos (*d.* 1435), the author of the *Additiones ad Lyram*, took the lead. In the same independent manner as these, Augustinus Justinianus of Genoa, in his *Octaplus Psalterii* (Genoa, 1516, fol.), draws mostly from the Midrasch and Sohar. A great preference was shown for Aben-Ezra and Kimchi; *e.g.* Bucer acknowledges that he is much indebted to them: *neque enim candidi ingenii est dissimulare, per quos profeceris.* At the beginning of the Reformation era, Justinianus, Pagninus and Felix were the three greatest authorities on the original text. The two first had acquired their knowledge of the original from Jewish instructors, and Felix Pratensis, whose *Psalterium ex hebreo diligentissime ad verbum fere translatum* was published in 1522 under Leo X., was a proselyte.

We have now reached the threshold of Reformation exegesis. In the dominant Church, Psalmody had degenerated into a lifeless ceremony. The exposition of the Psalms had become a slavish compilation of the comments of others and a heaping up of scholastic rubbish. *Et ipsa quamvis frigida tractatione Psalmorum*—says Luther in his preface to Bugenhagen's Latin Psalter—*aliquis tamen odor vitæ oblatus est plerisque bonæ mentis hominibus, et utcunque ex verbis illis etiam non intellectis semper aliquid consolationis et aurulæ senserunt e Psalmis pii, veluti ex roseto leniter spirantis.* Now, however, when in consequence of the Reformation there dawned upon the Church the new light of a grammatical and spiritually deep comprehension of the Scriptures—a light that was represented in Germany by Reuchlin and in France by Vatablus—the rose-garden of the Psalter also began to diffuse its odours as in the renewed freshness of a May morning, and German hymns, born again out of the Psalter, resounded from the shores of the Baltic to the foot of the Alps with all the fervour of a renewed first love.

"It is wonderful," says the Spanish Carmelite monk, Thomas a Jesu, "how greatly the hymns of Luther furthered the Lutheran cause. It is not only the churches and schools that resound with them, but even the private houses, the workshops, the markets, highways and fields." For, rendered into imperishable hymns (by Luther, Albinus, Franck, Gerhard, Jonas, Musculus, Poliander, Ringwaldt, and many others), the old Psalms passed once more into the congregational singing of the German as well as of the Scandinavian Lutheran Church;[1] in the French Church Clément Marot turned first thirty and then other nineteen Psalms into hymns (1541–43), and Theodore Beza afterwards added the rest (1562).[2] As early as 1542 Calvin introduced the Psalms in Marot's translation into the public worship of the Geneva Church, even translating a few of them himself (*e.g.* xxv., xlvi.). The Psalter remained the exclusive hymnbook of the Reformed Church down to the eighteenth century; Goudimel, the martyr of St. Bartholomew's night and teacher of Palestrina, supplied the melodies and chorales; Melissus Lobwasser and Martin Opitz naturalized the French Psalms even in Germany. The Anglican Church made the Psalms in their direct prose version an integral portion of its liturgy, in which the Psalter is divided into sixty divisions (as among the Greeks into sixty στάσεις) and gone through once a month; the Congregational Church followed the example of the sister Churches of the Continent. And how frequently the Psalter was rendered into Greek verse, as *e.g.*

[1] The Swedish metrical versions of the Psalms have recently been revised and increased for congregational use by Runeberg (Örebro, 1858); A. Treblin has formed a collection of German metrical versions of the whole Psalter, and has illustrated it by means of a sketch of the history of the poetical translations of the Psalms (Leipzig, Barth, 1882).

[2] *Vid.* Félix Bovet, *Les Psaumes de Marot et de Bèze*, in the Lausanne periodical, *Le Chrétien Évangélique*, 1866, No. 4; also his excellent *Histoire du Psautier des Églises Reformées*, 1872.

by Olympia Morata (*d.* 1555),[1] and under the influence of Melanchthon[2] into Latin. There had grown such a delight in this occupation and such a love for it, that even a German prince, Landgrave Moritz of Hesse, essayed it when a young man.[3] The paraphrases of Helius Eoban Hesse (of whom Herz, 1860, and Schwertzell, 1874, have given a biographical sketch),[4] John Major, Jacob Micyllus (whose life has been written by Classen, 1859), John Stigel (whose memory has been revived by Paulus Cassel, 1860), Ge. Bersmann (*d.* 1611), and also that of Geo. Buchanan, which was commenced by him during his confinement in a Portuguese monastery, are not merely learned works of art, but productions of a deep spiritual need; although we must agree with the judgment of Harless, that the best attempts of this kind are satisfying only in proportion as one first succeeds in forgetting the original. But since the time of the Reformation, the exegetical problem of Psalm-exposition has also been more clearly apprehended and more happily solved, than ever it was before. Reuchlin's "*hebræische Septene*," *i.e.* his exposition of the seven *Psalmi pœnitentiales*, of the year 1512, formed the commencement. In Luther, who began his academical lectures in 1513 with the Psalms (edited from the Dresden autograph by Seidemann, 2 vols., 1876),[5] and

[1] *Vid.* specimens in Bonnet's Life of Olympia Morata, translated into German by Merschmann, 1860, pp. 131–135.

[2] *Vid.* Wilh. Thilo, *Melanchthon im Dienste an heiliger Schrift* (Berlin, 1859), p. 28.

[3] In the year 1590, when he had completed his eighteenth year, he dedicated to his father, the Landgrave Wilhelm, as *studiorum primitiæ*, his *Davidis Regii Prophetæ Psalterium vario genere carminis Latine redditum*, printed in Schmalkald. The copy, which I possess, gives neither the date of its publication nor the name of the publisher.

[4] His Psalms, which appeared in 1537 (highly prized by Luther, and with notes by Veit Dietrich), passed through forty editions during the next seventy years.

[5] The Latin Psalter, printed in Wittenberg in the year 1513, upon the margin of which Luther wrote his Latin *scholia* in 1513 and later, is

who began to publish a portion of them in 1519 under the title *Operationes in duas Psalmorum decades*, there is combined the experimental depth of the Fathers with the Pauline recognition of the doctrine of free grace, the knowledge of which was restored by means of him to the Church. It is true, he is not altogether free from the tendency to allegorise and, in general, to deviate *a sensu literæ*, which was rejected by him *in thesi;* there is also still wanting in him an historical insight into the distinctive character of the two Testaments; in respect, however, of experimental, mystical, and yet healthy knowledge of the meaning of Scripture, he is incomparable; his expositions of the Psalms, especially of the penitential Psalms and of Psalm xc., are superior to all previous works on the subject, and will always remain a mine of wealth for future labourers. Bugenhagen's exposition of the Psalms (Basel, 1524, 4to, and freq.) continued the intermitted work of Luther, who commends it in a brief but forcible preface, as being the first exposition that was worthy of the name. Penetration and delicacy of judgment characterize the explanation of the five books of the Psalms by Aretius Felinus, *i.e.* Martin Bucer (1529, 4to, and freq.); the *Autophyes* (*= a se et per se Existens*), by which יהוה is rendered throughout,[1] gives it a strange appearance. As an exegete, however, it is Calvin that takes the place of equal honour alongside of the German Reformer. His commentary on the Psalms (first published at Geneva in 1557, folio), combines with psychological penetration a clearer discernment of the nature of the type and greater freedom in its way of looking at history, not, how-

preserved in Wolfenbüttel. The lectures (*dictata*) delivered by him on the Psalms during the years 1513–16, grew out of these *scholia*. Riehm has published the *scholia* on the seven penitential Psalms in a programme with the title, *Initium Theologiæ Lutheri:* Halle, 1874, 4to.

[1] The ὁ ὀντωτής or ὀντουργός of the *Græcus Venetus*, which unfortunately has not the translation of the Psalms, is similar.

ever, without aberrations of many kinds arising from this very freedom. Calvin's historical method of interpretation has become a caricature in Esrom Rüdinger, the teacher of the Moravian Brethren, who died in Altorf in 1591, without being able to carry out his intention of issuing in a revised form his commentary on the Psalms, which was published in 1580–81,—an original work which, after much vacillation, at last brings down even the first Psalm to the period of the Seleucidæ.

Among the expositors of the POST-REFORMATION period, Reinhard Bakius, the steadfast and prudent pastor of Magdeburg and Grimma during the Thirty Years' War, is the first to meet us. His *Comm. exegetico-practicus* on the Psalms (first edition, by his son, 1664), is a work full of extensive reading, genius and good sense; it is in many respects a welcome supplement to that of Luther; it is crammed full of all kinds of memorable things connected with the Psalms, among which, however, the thread of simple exposition is lost. Martin Geier keeps the task of the expositor more steadily in view and with greater self-restraint: his Leipzig lectures on the Psalms lasted for eighteen years. Deep piety and great erudition adorn his commentary (1668), but the free spirit of the Reformers is no longer here: even Geier is no longer able to avoid reading his doctrinal theology into his exegesis; an exegetical tradition has already become fixed, to depart from which is accounted heterodox. In the Reformed Church, Cocceius (*d.* 1669) stands forth prominently—an original and able man, but proceeding upon false hermeneutical principles, and consequently delighting too much in making the statements of the sacred writers refer to the history of future times. Not only the two Protestant Churches, however, but also the Romish Church took part in the work of expounding the Psalms in a furthering manner. Its most prominent expositors of the Psalms from 1550–1650 are Genebrardus, Agellius, de Muis (all three possessing a

knowledge of the Semitic languages and going back to the original text) and Bellarmin, who brought to the work not only uncommon natural talents, but also, within papistical limits, spiritual penetration. A little later, exposition of the Psalms within the Romish Church degenerated into scholasticism. This reaches its climax in le Blanc's *Psalmorum Davidicorum Analysis*, and in Jo. Lorinus' *Commentaria in Psalmos* (six folio vols., 1665–1676). In the Protestant Churches, however, there appears a similar lamentable decadence of the Reformation spirit. The *Adnotationes uberiores in Hagiographa* (t. i. 1745, 4to, Ps. and Prov.) by Jo. Heinr. Michaelis are a mass of undigested material: the glossarial exposition groans under the burden of innumerable unsifted proof and parallel passages. Hardly any notice is taken of what had been done previous to the seventeenth century; no use is made of the treasures contained in the works of Luther; even within his own Church Calvin no longer exercised any influence upon the exposition of Scripture. By 1750 exegesis had lost the spiritual and churchly character, which during the seventeenth century had grown in strength, although it had also gradually become torpid; whereas, as the expositions of the Psalms by de Sacy, Berthier and la Harpe show, it never became so shallow in the Romish Church as to deny the essential character of revealed religion. That love for the Psalms, out of which sprang the evangelical metrical psalter of the truly Christian poet and statesman, Chr. Karl Ludwig v. Pfeil [1] (published in 1747, with a preface by Bengel), degenerated more and more into a merely literary and, at the highest, poetical interest; exegesis became psychical and carnal. The remnant of what was spiritual is represented in this period of declension by Burk in his *Gnomon* on the Psalms (1760), which follows the model of Bengel, and by Chr. A. Crusius in the second part

[1] *Vid.* his Life by Heinr. Merz (1863), pp. 111–117.

(1761) of his *Hypomnemata ad Theologiam Propheticam*, a work which advances further along the path that had been recently opened up by Bengel, and is rich in germs of progressive knowledge (*vid.* my *Biblisch-prophetische Theologie*, 1845). We may learn the character of the theology of that age from Joh. Dav. Michaelis' translation of the Old Testament with notes for the unlearned (1771), and from his writings on individual Psalms. With regard to linguistic and historical matters, some service is rendered here; in all other respects, however, there is nothing but garrulous, diffuse, trivial insipidity, and spiritual deadness. To Herder belongs the credit of having set the exposition of the Psalms free from this insipidity; and it was Hengstenberg, first of all in his Lectures, who restored it from this unspiritual condition to the believing consciousness of the Church.

Rosenmüller's *Scholia* on the Psalms (first published in 1798–1804) mark the transition to *modern* exegesis. His work is a compilation, written in pure clear language, with exegetical tact, and with a thankworthy use of older expositors who had become unknown, such as Rüdinger, Bucer, Agellius, and even of Jewish interpreters. De Wette's commentary on the Psalms (1st edit. 1811, 5th edit. by Gustav Baur, 1856) was far more independent and formed an epoch in exegesis. De Wette is precise and clear, and not without æsthetic feeling; but his attitude to the biblical writers is too much that of a reviewer, his spirit of investigation is too sceptical, his appreciation of the Psalms takes too little account of their place in the history of redemption; he looks upon them simply as national hymns, to some extent even in the most ordinary patriotic sense, and when he fails in understanding them theologically, he avails himself of the catchword "theocratic," which he repeats *ad nauseam*. Nevertheless de Wette's commentary so far forms a new epoch, as it was the first to clear away the rubbish under which the exposition of the Psalms had hitherto been buried, and to in-

troduce into it taste, after the example of Herder, and grammatical accuracy, under the influence of Gesenius. He is far more independent than Rosenmüller, who, though not wanting in taste and tact, is only a compiler. In investigating the historical occasions of the Psalms, de Wette is negative rather than affirmative. Hitzig, in his historical and critical commentary (1835, 36), attempted to raise this negative criticism into positive. In his more recent commentary on the Psalms (vol. i., 1863, vol. ii., part 1, 1864, part 2, 1865), which meets the requirements of exegesis more adequately, his critical standpoint is essentially the same: he allows to David only fourteen of the seventy-three Psalms that bear the title לדוד, he assigns all the Psalms from lxxiii. onwards, along with Pss. i., ii., lx. (these three, and also cxlii.–cxliv., cl. being by Alexander Jannæus) to the Maccabæan period (*e.g.* cxxxviii.–cxli. are by Alexander's father, John Hyrcanus), and can even ascertain the authors (the Zechariah of 2 Chron. xxvi. 5, Isaiah, Jeremiah) or at least the date of composition of all the others. Von Lengerke, in his commentary (1847), which is compiled half from Hengstenberg and half from Hitzig, attached himself to this all-penetrating criticism, which everywhere brings out positive results with an almost mathematical certainty, and holds that it is Maccabee Psalms that form the real nucleus of the Psalter. He maintains that not a single Psalm can be ascribed to David with any certainty. Olshausen also belongs to the same school of criticism. In his commentary (1853) he leaves only a few Psalms, such as ii., xx., xxi., to the time of the Kings previous to the Exile; and, with a bias which he cannot resist, brings down all the others to the time of the Maccabees, some of them even to the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus. Hupfeld, on the other hand, declares in his commentary (1855–62, 4 vols.; 2nd ed., with valuable exegetical and critical additions by Riehm, 1867–71) that it is unworthy of earnest investigation to give oneself

up to such "childish playing with hypotheses;" and not only remains true to de Wette's negative criticism, but even attempts to carry it out still more thoroughly (he too asserts that there is not a single Psalm that can be ascribed to David with anything like certainty) and proceeds upon the assumption that, if even only a portion of the titles is false, for that very reason none of them may be used by us. We stand neither on the side of this scepticism, which everywhere negatives tradition, nor on the side of that self-confidence, which negatives it for the most part and sets up its own positive counter-assertions in opposition to it; but neither do we on this account ignore the great services which Olshausen, Hupfeld and Hitzig, each in his own way, have rendered to the exposition of the Psalms. In Olshausen we prize his great talent for conjectural criticism; in Hupfeld, his grammatical accuracy and the thoroughness of his studies so far as they go; in Hitzig, his originality which is always stimulating, his happy ingenuity in tracing out the connection of the thoughts, and his marvellous erudition which is manifested in bringing out the usage of the language and what is syntatically admissible. Apart from the introductory portion, the commentary of Ewald (*Poetische Bb.*, 1839, 40; 2nd ed., 1866), in accordance with its plan, meets the requirements of exegesis only fragmentarily; in the argument, however, that is prefixed to the individual Psalms, it discovers a wonderful gift for hearing the throbbings of the heart of the sacred poets, and for entering sympathetically into their changes of emotion. None of these expositors, however, stands in truly spiritual *rapport* with the spirit of the psalmists. The much abused commentary of Hengstenberg (1842–47, 4 vols.; 2nd ed. 1849–52) was accordingly an epoch-making phenomenon, inasmuch as it was the first to bring the exposition of the Psalms once more into connection with the life of the Church, and was not satisfied with merely bringing out their grammatico-historical sense. The kindred works of Umbreit

(*Christliche Erbauung aus dem Psalter*, 1835) and Stier (*Siebzig Psalmen*, 1834, 36), which extend only to a selection from the Psalms, may be regarded as its forerunners; and we may consider the commentary of Tholuck (1847), which excludes the linguistic side and seeks to make a practical use of the results of exegetical progress for the behoof of the laity, as its counterpart. For the sake of completeness we also mention the commentary of Köster (1837), which has become of importance for the appreciation of the artistic form of the Psalms, especially of their strophe-system, Vaihinger's (1845), as well as the theologico-homiletical commentary of C. B. Moll, which, though not without independence, makes use of its scientific forerunners, and forms the eleventh division of Lange's *Bibelwerk* (1869–71). Among English commentaries, those of Perowne (3rd ed., 1873–4) and of F. C. Cook (with the co-operation of Johnson and Elliott, in vol. iv. of the *Speaker's Commentary*, 1873), which make use of their German and English forerunners, represent the present phase of Psalm-exposition. Franco-Swiss literature has furnished translations of the Psalms by Armand de Mestral, Perret-Gentil and Louis Segond (*L'Ancien Testament*, 1877), which vie with one another in respect of exegetical fidelity and elegance of style; the first place, however, belongs to the commentary on the Psalter of the Strassburg veteran Ed. Reuss in the fifth division (2nd ed. 1879) of the Old Testament half of his French *Bibelwerk*.[1]

Charles Bruston's work, *Du text primitif des Psaumes* (Paris, 1873), Dyserinck's *Kritische Scholiën* (Leiden, 1878), and Friedr. Baethgen's (of Kiel) *Kritische Noten*, in the *Studien u. Kritiken* for the year 1880, as well as in the articles we have already mentioned on the value of the ancient versions of the Psalms for the criticism of the text (1882),

[1] In his *Geschichte der h. Schriften A. T.* (1881), p. 186, he claims for himself the right of priority in regard to the doubt, whether Davidic Psalms have come down to us.

concern themselves with the criticism of the text of the Psalms. Van den Ham's *Psalmen met historische Opschriften* (1871) essays the criticism of the historical titles of the Psalms. Grätz' *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Psalmen* (2 vols., 1882–1883) goes to the very extreme in respect of unbridled conjectural criticism. Giesebrecht's investigation of the literary form of the Psalms and the date of their composition to be inferred from thence (treating of books ii. to v.) in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1881 is scientifically more exact, but too much influenced by the new phase of Pentateuch criticism. He comes to the conclusion, that it is hardly possible to find a single pre-exilic hymn in the two last books of the Psalter (Pss. xc.–cvi., and cvii.–cl.); that the Asaphic Psalms are all post-exilic (or exilic), and that, along with the supplement to book iii. (Pss. lxxxiv.–lxxxix), they are all possibly even Maccabæan; that none of the Korahitic hymns are pre-exilic, and that on the whole the second book also, both in respect of contents and language, has the physiognomy of the post-exilic period. From this we can easily foresee what will be his judgment, as yet reserved, on Pss. lxxii., cx. and ii. "The Psalter," says Stade (*Zeitschrift*, 1882, p. 166) "is a product of post-exilic Judaism. The piety that finds expression in it is, in its individual idiosyncracy, a post-exilic phenomenon. Previous to the Exile the soil for Psalm-poetry was altogether wanting. We do not mean hereby to assert, that no exilic or pre-exilic hymns could be contained in the Psalter. But *a priori* each poem that is found in it must be accounted post-exilic, until the opposite is proved by plain indications." [1]

Compared with such criticism, which, in addition to Reuss and Kuenen, finds its most original advocate in Wellhausen, my commentary, even in this new and revised edition, is a book outstripped by scientific progress. But even if I had

[1] We may only mention in passing, that Grätz ascribes the honour of having arranged the Psalter to Hillel and Schammai or their schools.

still to live for another generation, I should be unable to assimilate myself with the spirit which inspires this criticism. However, the present phase of Old Testament criticism is not its last, and while criticism is undoubtedly an essential function of biblical science, it is nevertheless not its sole activity, and by no means the ultimate end it has in view.

X. Preliminary Theological Considerations.

The expositor of the Psalms may place himself either upon the standpoint of the poet, or upon that of the Old Testament community, or upon that of the Church. It is a fundamental condition of progress in exegesis that these three standpoints be kept separate, and that a distinction be accordingly drawn between the two Testaments, and, in general, between the several stages through which the revelation and the knowledge of redemption have passed. For not only redemption itself but also the revelation and the knowledge of it have had a progressive history, which reaches on from Paradise down through time into eternity. Redemption realises itself in a system of facts, in which God's loving purpose to redeem sinful humanity is unfolded; and the revelation of redemption anticipates this gradual realization, in order at once to guarantee its Divine authorship, and to render its comprehension possible. In the Psalms there is presented to us more than half a millennium of this progressive realization, disclosure, and apprehension of redemption. And when we take into account the fact that one Psalm is dated from the time of Moses, and that the retrospective glances of the historical Psalms go back even to the age of the patriarchs, we may say that there is scarcely an occurrence that constituted an epoch in connection with the history of redemption, from the election of Abraham down to the new position assigned in the world to the post-exilic nation, which does not somehow or other

find its expression in the Psalter. Nor is it merely facts external to it that re-echo in its lyrics; but seeing that David, next to Abraham undoubtedly the most significant religious character of the Old Testament, is its chief author, it is itself a direct, integral portion of the history of redemption. And it is also a source of information for the history of the revelation of redemption, inasmuch as it flowed not merely from the spirit of faith, but also at the same time largely from the spirit of prophecy; above all, however, it is our most important memorial of the progressive apprehension of the knowledge of redemption, seeing it shows how, between the giving of the law from Sinai, and the proclamation of the gospel from Sion, the final and essential redemption broke a path for itself in the consciousness and the spiritual life of the Jewish Church.

1. We shall consider, in the first place, *the relation of the Psalms to the prophecy of the coming Christ.* When the human beings, whom God had created, had ruined themselves by falling into sin, He did not abandon them to the doom of wrath which they had chosen for themselves, but visited them on the evening of that most unhappy day, in order to make that doom a disciplinary medium of His love. This visitation of Jahve-Elohim was the first step taken by Him in connection with the history of redemption towards the goal of the Incarnation; and the so-called *protevangelium* was the laying of the first foundation of the verbal revelation of Himself by means of the law and the gospel—a revelation which prepared the way, in accordance with the plan of redemption, towards this goal of the Incarnation and the restoration of humanity. The way of this redemption, which breaks a path for itself in history, and at the same time also announces itself to the human consciousness, runs through the whole of Israel's career; and the Psalms show us with what vital energy this seed-corn of words and deeds of divine love has unfolded itself in the hearts of

believing Israelites. They bear the impress of the time, during which the preparation of the way of redemption was concentrated upon Israel, and the hope of redemption had become a national hope; for after humanity had broken up into separate nationalities, redemption retired within the limits of a chosen people, in order that it might there come to maturity, and then, bursting these limits, become the possession of the whole human race. At that time the promise of the coming Mediator was in its third stage. The prospect of victory over the power of temptation in the human race had been connected with the seed of the woman, the prospect of a blessing for all peoples, with that of the patriarch; in these days, however, when David became the creator of psalm-poetry to be used in divine worship, the promise had become Messianic; it pointed the hope of the faithful to the king of Israel, and in fact to David and his seed; redemption and glory, for Israel in the first place, and indirectly also for the Gentiles, were looked for through the mediatorial office of Jahve's Anointed. The fact that among all the Davidic Psalms there is found but one (viz. Ps. cx.), in which, as in his last words (2 Sam. xxiii. 1–7), he looks out into the future of his seed and has the Messiah objectively before him, is accounted for only by the circumstance, that up to this time he himself was the object of Messianic hope, and that it was only gradually, and more especially in consequence of his deep fall, that this hope was dissevered from him personally, and transferred to the future. Then when Solomon ascended the throne, the Messianic longings and hopes centred, as Ps. lxxii. shows, upon him; they applied to the one final Christ of God, but for a long time they clung enquiringly, and, on the ground of 2 Sam. vii., with perfect right, to the direct son of David. Even in Ps. xlv., it is a descendant of David, contemporary with the Korahite singer, to whom the Messianic promise is applied as a marriage blessing, in the hope that it may be

realised in him. But it soon became manifest that neither in this king, any more than in Solomon, had He yet appeared, who is the full realisation of the Messianic idea; and when, in the time of the later kings, the kingdom of David became more and more glaringly inconsistent with its sacred vocation, Messianic hope broke entirely with the present, which became merely the dark back-ground, from which the image of the Messiah, as being purely future, stood forth in relief. The בן־דוד, around whom the prophecy of the period of the later kings revolves, and whom even Ps. ii. sets forth before the kings of the earth, in order that they may pay him homage, is (even supposing that the אחרית was expected to dawn immediately after the present) an eschatological person. In the mouth of the Old Testament Church even Pss. xlv. and cxxxii., seeing that their contents pointed to the future, have become Messianic in a prophetical or eschatological sense. It is surprising, however, that the number of such Psalms as are not merely typically Messianic is so small, and that the Church of the post-exilic period[1] has not enriched the Psalter with a single Psalm that is Messianic in the stricter sense. In the later portion of the Psalter, theocratic Psalms, as distinguished from those that are strictly Messianic, are more numerously represented. By theocratic Psalms we mean such as have to do, not with the kingdom of Jahve's Anointed, which overcomes and blesses the world, not with the Christocracy, in which the theocracy attains the summit of its representation, but with the theocracy as such, completed both outwardly and inwardly in its self-manifestation,—not with the Parousia of a human king, but with the Parousia of Jahve Himself, with the kingdom of God revealed in all its glory. For the

[1] We refer to the period immediately after the Exile; for towards the end of the Maccabæan period, Messianic hope broke out afresh, as the Salomonic Psalter shows:—its revival and declension are determined by the law of contrast.

proclamation of redemption contained in the Old Testament runs on in two parallel lines: the one has as its termination the Anointed of Jahve, who rules over all nations from out of Zion, the other, the LORD Himself, sitting above the Cherubim, to whom the whole earth pays homage. These two lines do not meet in the Old Testament; it is the history of the fulfilment of prophecy that first makes it clear that the Parousia of the Anointed One and the Parousia of Jahve are one and the same. And of these two lines the divine is the one that predominates in the Psalms; the hope of the psalmists, more especially after the kingdom had ceased in Israel, is generally directed beyond the human mediation directly towards Jahve, the author of redemption. The fundamental article of Old Testament faith runs יְשׁוּעָתָה לַיהוָה (iii. 9; Jon. ii. 10). The Messiah is not yet recognised as a God-man. Accordingly the Psalms know neither of prayer to Him, nor of prayer in His name. But prayer to Jahve and for Jahve's sake is essentially the same thing. For Jahve implies Jesus. Jahve is the Saviour. The Saviour, when He shall appear, is nothing else save the יְשׁוּעָה of this God in a visible manifestation (Isa. xlix. 6).

As regards the divine-human goal of Old Testament history, we distinguish five classes of Psalms, which point to it. Since 2 Sam. vii. the promise of the Messiah is no longer connected with the tribe of Judah in general, but with David; and it points not merely to the endless duration of his kingdom, but also to one scion of his house, in whom the divinely appointed destiny of his seed to be a blessing, first to Israel, and thence to all the nations of the world, is to be fully realised, and without whom, therefore, the Davidic kingdom would be a headless trunk. Psalms in which the poet, looking beyond his own age, comforts himself with the vision of this king, in whom the promise is finally fulfilled, we call *Messianic in an eschatological* and indeed *directly eschatological* sense. Such Psalms do not merely base them-

selves upon the word of prophecy that was already in existence, but even carry it still further; it is only by means of their lyrical form that they are distinguished from prophecy in the strictest sense; for prophecy is a proclamation, and the Psalms are spiritual songs.

The Messianic purport of the Psalms, however, is not limited to the element of strict prediction, to which the future becomes objective. Just as natural life presents a series of stages, in which the lower stage of existence points preformatively to that which is next in order above it, and indirectly to that which is highest, so that, *e.g.*, in the globular form of a drop there is announced the striving after organism, as it were, in the simplest fugitive outline, so the progress of history, and more especially of the history of redemption, is also typical; and the life of David, not only as a whole, but also most surprisingly even in individual traits, is a *vaticinium reale* of the life of Him, whom prophecy regards as David raised up again as it were in a glorified form, and whom it therefore directly names עבדי דוד (Ezek. xxxiv. 23*f.*, xxxvii. 24 *f.*) and דוד מלכם (Hos. iii. 5; Jer. xxx. 9). Such Psalms, in which David himself (or even a poet putting himself into David's position and mood) gives lyrical utterance to typical critical events in his life, we call *typico-Messianic* Psalms. To this class, however, there belong not only such as have David, directly or indirectly, for their subject; for the path of suffering which was trodden by all the Old Testament saints in general, and more especially by the prophets in the fulfilment of their calling (*vid.* on xxxiv. 20*f.*, and Ps. lxix.), has become in a certain sense a τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. All these Psalms, not less than those of the first class, may be cited in the New Testament with ἵνα πληρωθῇ; only with this difference, that in the former it is the prophetic word, in the latter the prophetic history, that is fulfilled. The older theologians, especially the Lutheran, oppose the assumption that there are such typological cita-

tions of the Old Testament in the New;[1] they had not yet attained to the organic view of history granted to our age, and were therefore also without the true counterpoise to their rigid theory of inspiration.

There is, however, also a class of Psalms, which we call *Messianic* in a *typico-prophetical* sense. These are Psalms in which David, when describing experiences of his inner and outer life which were already typical in themselves, is raised above the limits of his own individuality and time, and uses regarding himself hyperbolical expressions, which were not to become full historical truth until they became so in Christ. Such Psalms are typical, inasmuch as their contents are rooted in the individual, but typical history of David; at the same time, however, they are prophetical, inasmuch as they give expression to that which is present and individual in complaints, hopes and descriptions that point far beyond the present, and are first fulfilled in Christ. The psychological possibility of such Psalms has been called in question; with the same injustice, however, as it was objected to Kant, on account of his distinction between an intelligible and a sensible Ego, that he posited two subjects in one personality. The mystery of these Psalms is at bottom the mystery of all poetry. The genuine lyric poet does not give a mere copy of the impressions of his empirical Ego; an ideal Ego, as Vinet says somewhere, overhears, as it were, this empirical Ego; it is this second soul that makes the poet. Now, just as the poet does not form a mere cast of his impressions, but idealises them, *i.e.* seizes them by the root of their idea, and stripping off and

[1] The fifth Ecumenical Council also already denied it, when it condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia's typical interpretation of Pss. xvi., xxii. and lxix. He remarks on Ps. xxii.: *Quod supra modum dictum fuerat prius a David propter illata ei mala, hoc ex operibus evenit in Domino Christo. Vid.* Baethgen, *Der Psalmen-Commentar des Theodor. v. M. in syrischer Bearbeitung*, in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, v. 1885.

abstracting all that is adventitious and unimportant lifts them up into the region of the ideal, so David also in these Psalms idealises his experiences and anticipations. The natural result of this is, that these are reduced to that in them which is essentially typical; he does this, however, not in a condition of poetical self-stimulation, but as moved by the Spirit of God; and this has the further consequence, that the lifting up of his experiences into the region of the ideal is at the same time a lifting of them up into the region of the antitype; in other words, the statement of his typical fortunes and the corresponding moods has assumed the form of a predictive statement of the fortunes and moods of his antitype. Τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (1 Pet. i. 11)—this is the soul of his ideal Ego; this is his "second soul."

Besides these three classes of Messianic Psalms, we may regard such Psalms as the forty-fifth and the seventy-second as forming a fourth class of *indirectly eschatologico-Messianic* Psalms. These are Psalms in which, in keeping with the circumstances of the time at which they were composed, Messianic hopes were centred upon a contemporary king, without, however, having been fulfilled in him; so that in the mouth of the Church, which was still waiting for their final fulfilment, they have become eschatological hymns, and we are perfectly justified in interpreting them *as such*, as well as in their bearing upon their own time.

A fifth class is formed by the *eschatologico-Jehovistic* Psalms. These concern themselves with the Parousia of Jahve, and with the consummation of His kingdom that is being gradually brought about by means of judgment (*vid.* Ps. xciii.). The number of these Psalms preponderates in the Psalter. They contain the other premise for the divine-human end of the history of redemption. Lightning-like illuminations of this end are to be found in the prophets. But it is reserved to history itself to draw the final conclusions of the *unio person-*

alis from these human and divine premises. The Redeemer, to whom the faith of the Old Testament betook itself, is Jahve. Its hope was centred, not in the human, but in the Divine King. That the Redeemer, when He should appear, would be God and man in one person, was an idea foreign to the consciousness of the Old Testament Church. And it is only in individual rays that the knowledge, that He would be sacrifice and priest in one person, breaks in upon the Old Testament darkness, the pole star of which is יהוה and only יהוה.

2. When we turn now, in the second place, to consider the *relation of the Psalms to the legal sacrifices*, we find that this also is different from what we, looking at the matter from the standpoint of fulfilment, would naturally expect. It is true there are not wanting passages, in which the offering of the outward, legal sacrifice is recognised as a taking part in religious worship on the part of the individual and the Church (lxvi. 15, li. 21); but those passages are more numerous, in which the external sacrifice is compared so disparagingly with the λογικὴ λατρεία, that, no regard being had to its divine appointment, it appears as something not really desired by God at all, as a shell that should be cast away, as a form that should be broken in pieces (xl. 7*f.*, l., li. 18*f.*). It is not this, however, that surprises us. This is the very point, wherein the Psalms contribute their share towards the progress of the history of redemption; it is the process of writing the law upon the heart, commenced already in Deuteronomy, that is continued here upon the ground of the memorable word of Samuel (1 Sam. xv. 22*f.*); it is the gradually waxing spirit of the New Testament, that in this and in other respects in the Psalter is breaking down the legal barriers, and stripping off the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, as a butterfly casts off its chrysalis. But what is put in the place of the sacrifices that are criticised so disparagingly? Contrition of heart, prayer, thankfulness, self-surrender to God in the

doing of His will; just as in Prov. xxi. 3, doing justly; in Hos. vi. 6, kindness; in Mic. vi. 6–8, doing justly, love, humility; and in Jer. vii. 21–23, obedience. This is what is surprising. The sacrifice that is depreciated is looked upon merely as a symbol, not as a type; it is regarded only ethically, not in its connection with the history of redemption; it is only so far as it is a gift to God (קרבן), not so far as the gift is appointed to be an expiation (כפרה), that its character is brought out;—in one word, the mystery of the blood remains undisclosed. In a case, where the New Testament consciousness must think of sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ, mention is made (li. 9) of the sprinkling that formed part of the legal ritual for the cleansing and putting away of sin; but although the language is plainly figurative, there is no explanation of the figure. Whence comes this?—Because, speaking generally, the sacrifice of blood, as such, remains a question in the Old Testament, to which almost only Isa. liii. (in addition to Zech. xii. 10 and xiii. 7) gives a plain answer that is in keeping with the historical fulfilment. It is in such late prophetic words as these, that the delineation of the Passion and the self-sacrifice of Christ first becomes the subject of direct prediction; and it is the history of the fulfilment given in the Gospels that first shows, how closely in keeping with the Anti-type was the form that the Spirit, which spoke through David in his passion Psalms, gave to the utterances of the type regarding himself. In regard to reconciliation as well as redemption in general, the believing confidence of the Old Testament, as it expresses itself in the Psalms, rested upon Jahve. He is not only the Saviour, but also the Reconciler (מכפר), from whom propitiation is entreated and hoped for (lxxix. 9, lxv. 4, lxxviii. 38, lxxxv. 3, etc.). At the end of the way which He took through history to redemption Jahve is indeed God in Christ, and the blood that was given by Him as a typical means of propitiation (Lev. xvii. 11) is, in

the Anti-type, that of the God-man, and so far His own (Acts xx. 28).

3. Advancing from this point, we shall now, in the third place, look at the *relation in which the Psalms stand to the New Testament righteousness of faith, and to the New Testament morality that flows from the fundamental law of all-embracing love.* With respect both to the idea of reconciliation and of redemption, the Psalms undergo a metamorphosis in the consciousness of the praying New Testament Church, a metamorphosis rendered possible by the unfolding and specialising of redemption that have taken place since they were written, and with which they fit in without constraint. Only in two points does it seem difficult to make the precatory contents of the Psalms amalgamate with the Christian consciousness. The one of these is the ethical self-consciousness, bordering upon self-righteousness, that frequently asserts itself before God in the Psalms; the other is the jealous wrath against enemies and persecutors that discharges itself in fearful imprecations. The self-righteousness, it is true, is only in appearance; for the righteousness to which the psalmists appeal is not the merit of works, not a sum of good deeds, that are recounted to God with a claim for reward, but a bending of the will and a shaping of the life, that is in accordance with the mind of God, that has its roots in the emptying of self and in the surrendering of one's self to Him, and that looks upon itself as the result of His justifying, sanctifying, preserving and guiding grace (lxxiii. 25*f.*, xxv. 5–7, xix. 14, etc.). Nor is there wanting an acknowledgment that the basis of our nature is inherently sinful (li. 7), that apart from God's grace man is justly liable to be condemned before Him (cxliii. 2), that the sins even of the converted are many and to a great extent unknown to himself (xix. 3), that forgiveness of sins is the indispensable condition of blessedness (xxxii. 1*f.*), that a new and divinely created heart is an absolute necessity (li. 12)—there is an

acknowledgment, in short, that the way of salvation consists in penitence, forgiveness and renewal. On the other hand, however, it is no less true that, in the light of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ and of the Spirit of regeneration, there is rendered possible an ethical self-criticism which cuts far more deeply and distinguishes far more precisely; that the tribulation, which befalls the New Testament believer, while it does not indeed excite in him the same keen sense of the wrath of God which is so frequently expressed in the Psalms, nevertheless, in view of the cross upon Golgotha and the heaven opened to him, sinks deeper into his inmost heart, seeing it now appears to him as an appointment of chastening, proving and preparing love; and that, now the righteousness of God, which makes over our unrighteousness, and which is accounted a gift of grace even by the Old Testament consciousness, is presented for our believing appropriation as a righteousness that has been worked out historically through the active and passive obedience of Jesus, the dissimilarity as well as the reciprocal conditionality of the righteousness of faith and the righteousness of life has become a fact of the inner life that is far more clearly recognised and is fraught with more important consequences.[1] Nevertheless it is not impossible to translate even such self-testimonies as xvii. 1–5 into the language of the New Testament consciousness; for they do not hinder the latter when using them from thinking especially of the righteousness of faith,

[1] Cf. Kurz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, iii.: *Die Selbst-gerechtigkeit der Psalm-sänger* in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1865, 352–358. "The righteousness of faith set forth in the Old Testament, and represented by the *evangelium visibile* of the ritual of sacrifice, has not yet attained the fundamental and primary position assigned to it in the New Testament, and more especially by Paul. Its position is rather secondary and auxiliary; justification does not present itself to the consciousness as a condition of the sanctification that is to be striven after, but only as a complement of the defects that adhere to the sanctification that has been inadequately attained."

of the divine deeds that are sacramentally applied, and of the life of regeneration that asserts itself victoriously in the midst of the old every-day life. By means of them the Christian must also feel himself earnestly exhorted to self-examination, to see whether his faith is actually manifesting itself as the productive power of a new life; and here too the difference between the two Testaments loses its harshness in view of the great truths—truths condemnatory of all moral shallowness—that the Church of Christ is a Church of saints, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin, and that he who is born of God does not sin.

As regards the so-called imprecatory Psalms,[1] however, it is certainly true that, in the attitude of the Christian and the Church to the enemies of Christ, the longing for their removal is outweighed by the longing for their conversion. On the assumption, however, that they will not be converted, and will not anticipate the penal judgment by repenting, the passing over of the jealousy of love into that of anger is justified also in the New Testament (*e.g.* Gal. v. 12); and on the assumption that their devilish obduracy has become absolute, even the Christian need not shrink from praying for their ultimate overthrow. For the kingdom of God does not come only by the way of grace, but also by the way of judgment; the coming of God's kingdom is what is longed for by the suppliant of the Old Testament as well as of the New (*vid.* ix. 21, lix. 14, etc.); and in the Psalms also every imprecation of judgment upon those, who set themselves to oppose the coming of this kingdom, is made upon the assumption of their persistent impenitence (*vid.* vii. 13*f.*, cix. 17). Where, however, as in Pss. lxix. and cix., the imprecations enter into the most minute details, and extend to the descendants of the unhappy mortal and even to eternity,

[1] *Vid.* Kurz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, iv.: *Die Fluch- und Rachepsalmen*, *ibid.*, 359–372, and my remarks at the beginning of two of the Psalms in question (Pss. xxxv. and cix.).

there is no other justification of them than that they have proceeded from a prophetic spirit; and they cannot be appropriated by the Christian in any other sense, than that, as he uses them in prayer, he ascribes glory to the righteousness of God, and commends himself the more earnestly to His grace.

4. *The relation of the Psalms*, in the fourth place, *to the last things* is also such that, in order to their becoming an expression in prayer of the faith of the New Testament, they need to be deepened and adjusted. For what Julius Africanus says regarding the Old Testament: οὐδέπω δέδοτο ἐλπὶς ἀναστάσεως σαφής, is true at least of the time previous to Isaiah. In one of his latest cycles of apocalyptic prophecies (c. xxiv.–xxvii.) Isaiah first foretells the first resurrection, *i.e.* the resuscitation of the company of martyrs that have fallen a prey to death (xxvi. 19), as well as, with enlarged field of vision, the cessation altogether of death (xxv. 8); the Book of Daniel, that Apocalypse of the Old Testament sealed until the time of fulfilment, first predicts the general resurrection, *i.e.* the awakening of some to life and of others to judgment (xii. 2); between these two prophecies stands Ezekiel's vision of the bringing of Israel out of the Exile under the figure of a creative reanimating of a large field of dead bodies (c. xxxvii.)—a figure, which at least presupposes that, to the wonder-working power of God's faithfulness to His promise, that which it represents is not impossible. But even in the latest Psalms the knowledge of redemption nowhere shows itself as yet so far advanced that these prophetic words regarding the resurrection could have been transformed into a dogmatic, integral portion of the Church's faith; the hope that the scattered bones will spring up again ventures to suggest itself at first only in a bold figure (cxli. 7); the hopeless darkness of Sheôl is not rolled away (vi. 6, xxx. 10, lxxxviii. 11–13); where mention is made of deliverance from death and Hades,

what is meant is the preservation, already experienced (*e.g.* lxxxvi. 13) or hoped for (*e.g.* cxviii. 17), of the living from their attack; and there are other passages alongside of these, which declare the impossibility of escaping from this universal human fate (lxxxix. 49). On the other hand, there are also passages in the Psalms, in which the hope, not to fall a prey to death, is expressed in so absolute a manner, that the thought of this unavoidable destiny is swallowed up entirely by the assurance of life in the strength of God the living One (lvi. 14, and especially xvi. 9–11); others in which the gracious fellowship with Jahve is set over against this temporal life and its possessions (xvii. 14*f.*, lxiii. 4) in such a manner, that there naturally results the antithesis of a life that transcends time and extends beyond this transitory state of existence; others in which the destiny of the godless is contrasted with that of the righteous as dying with living, defeat with triumph (xlix. 15), so that the conclusion is inevitably suggested that the former die, although they seem to live for ever, while the latter live for ever, although they die; and others in which the psalmist seems to anticipate that, instead of having to fall a prey to death and Hades, he will be translated to God's presence somewhat after the manner of Enoch and Elijah (xlix. 16, lxxiii. 24). But nowhere do we find in the Psalms an article of faith that was generally received; we merely see how faith in a future life has striven to penetrate the gloom, at first only as an individual conclusion drawn from premises that were experimentally certain to the believing consciousness; and far from the grave and Hades being deprived of their power by an explicit knowledge of a better future, they have rather only vanished momentarily, as it were, before the ecstatic feeling of a life derived from God, a feeling which disregards them, and have not therefore as yet been actually and permanently overcome. For the very same reason there is not to be found in the Psalms any more than in the Book of

Job a perfectly satisfactory theodocy in respect of such a distribution of lots on this side the grave as seems incompatible with God's righteousness. Pss. vii., xlix. and lxxiii. no doubt approximate to the right solution; but even the solution given in them is still but an anticipation and a suggestion.[1]

Nevertheless there is nothing clearly revealed in the New Testament which was not already stirring in the Psalms. For in the view of the psalmists death and life are such radical notions (notions, that is to say, apprehended by them as rooted in the principles of divine wrath and divine love), that it is easy for New Testament faith, to which they have been fully disclosed even to their background in hell and heaven, to adjust and deepen all the utterances in the Psalms that refer to them. It is by no means contrary to the mind of the psalmist, if in such passages as vi. 6 the New Testament suppliant substitutes Gehenna for Hades; for the psalmists dread Hades only as being the realm of wrath or of separation from God's love, which is the true life of men. Nor is it contrary to the mind of the poets to think in xvii. 15 of the future beholding of the face of God in all His glory, and in xlix. 15 of the resurrection morning; for the hopes that are expressed there in a spiritually exalted condition of soul are really, so far as regards their truly satisfy-

[1] *Vid.* Kurz, *Zur Theologie der Psalmen*, ii.: *Die Vergeltungslehre der Psalmen*, *ibid.*, pp. 316–352. Klostermann in his *Untersuchungen* (1868) proceeds upon the correct assumption, that in the consciousness of his personal relation to God the Old Testament saint had the assurance of a future restoration from the dead; but he overlooks the historical process, during which the potential contents of immediate consciousness only gradually become the actual contents of reflected consciousness. Schultz in his *Alttest. Theologie* (p. 660) acknowledges, at least in principle, both the germ existing from the beginning and its gradual development. In his work on *The Psalms: their History, Teachings and Use* (2nd edition, 1886), Dr. Wm. Binnie proceeds rightly upon the assumption, that in this respect the Psalms cannot be inferior to the Vedas, referring to Max Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop*, p. 45.

ing fulfilment, hopes that belong to the future life As Oetinger says, there is no essential New Testament truth that is not contained in the Psalms, if not *νοΐ* (in its unfolded sense), at least *πνεύματι*. The Old Testament barrier already encompasses the gradually developing life of the New Testament, which is one day to break through it. The eschatology of the Old Testament leaves a dark background, which is laid out, as it were, to be divided by the New Testament revelation into light and darkness, and to be lit up into a wide perspective that extends into the eternity that lies beyond time. Wherever it begins to dawn in the eschatological darkness of the Old Testament, it is already the first morning rays of the sunrise of the New, that is thus announcing itself.[1] In this respect also the Christian cannot refrain from disregarding the barrier of the psalmists, and understanding the Psalms according to the mind of the Spirit, who, even during the development of redemption and of the knowledge of it, kept the goal and the consummation steadily in view. Thus understood the Psalms are hymns of the Israel of the New Testament no less than of that of the Old.

The Church, when it uses the language of the Psalms as supplications, celebrates the unity of the two Testaments, and science, when expounding them, does honour to the distinction between the Old and the New. They are both in the right: the former in regarding the Psalms in the light of the one essential salvation, the latter in keeping apart the sacred eras, and the various stages through which the knowledge of salvation has passed.

[1] The literature bearing upon the Old Testament doctrine of immortality is arranged chronologically, and with rare fulness, in Ezra Abbot's (Prof. in Cambridge, Massachusetts) *Literature of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (New York, 1871), originally an appendix to W. R. Alger's *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, 1864.

EXPOSITION OF THE PSALTER.

Cum consummaverit homo, tunc incipiet, et cum quieverit, aporiabitur (novis aporiis urgebitur).

—Sir. xviii. 6 (applied by Augustine to the expositor of the Psalms).

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE PSALTER.

PSALMS I.–XLI.

PSALM I.

THE DIVERGING DESTINY OF THE PIOUS AND THE UNGODLY.

1 Happy the man, that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,
Nor standeth in the way of sinners,
Nor sitteth in the company of scoffers;
2 But in the law of Jahve hath his delight
And in His law searcheth he day and night.—
3 He is like a tree planted by water-courses,
That bringeth forth its fruit in due season,
And whose leaf withereth not,
And whatsoever he doeth, he carrieth out to completion.

4 Not so are the ungodly,
But they are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.
5 Therefore the ungodly stand not in the judgment,
Nor sinners in the assembly of the righteous.
6 For Jahve knoweth the way of the righteous,
But the way of the ungodly perisheth.

The collection of the Psalms and that of the prophecies of Isaiah resemble one another in this, that the latter begins with a discourse, the former with a Psalm, neither of which has a title, but which open the two collections after the manner of prologues. From Acts xiii. 33, where the words, "*Thou art my Son . . .*" are quoted as being found ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ, we perceive that in very early times Ps. i. was regarded as a prologue to the collection. The reading,

ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ, which was already rejected by Griesbach, is an old correction. But that way of counting rests upon tradition. A scholium from Origen and Eusebius says regarding Pss. i. and ii.: ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ συνημμένοι. So also Apollinaris:

Ἐπιγραφῆς ὁ ψαλμὸς εὑρέθη δίχα,
Ἡνωμένος δὲ τοῖς παρ' Ἑβραίοις στίχοις.

For it is an old Jewish view, as Albertus Magnus remarks: *Psalmus primus incipit a beatitudine et terminatur in beatitudinem*, i.e. it begins with אשרי (i. 1) and ends with אשרי (ii. 12), so that, as is said in *Berachoth*, 9 *b* (cf. *j. Taanith*, ii. 2), Pss. i. and ii. consequently form one whole (חדא פרשה). This was certainly not the original state of the case. No doubt Pss. i. and ii. coincide in several respects (there יהגה, here יהגו; there ודרך תאבד, here ותאבדו דרך; there אשרי at the beginning, here at the end); but these phraseological coincidences do not warrant us to conclude (with Hitzig) that both were composed by the same author, and still less that they were originally members of but one whole. The two anonymous hymns belong together only so far as the one is fitted to form the proem of the Psalter from its ethical, the other from its prophetical side. It is questionable, however, if even this was present to the mind of the compiler. It is possible that it was simply because of these coincidences that Ps. ii. was attached to Ps. i.; the latter is the real prologue of the Psalter, which is arranged in the form of a Pentateuch after the pattern of the Thôra. For the Psalter is Yea and Amen in hymns to the divine word of the Thôra. For this reason it begins with a Psalm which contrasts the destiny of the lover of the Thôra with that of the godless,—an echo of the exhortation (Josh. i. 8) in which, after the death of Moses, Jahve commends the book of the Thôra to his successor, Joshua. Just as the New Testament Sermon on the Mount, seeing it is a proclamation of the engrafted law, begins with μακάριοι, so the Old Testa-

ment Psalter, which aims from first to last at this engrafting, begins with אַשְׁרֵי. The first book of Psalms begins with two *aschrès* (i. 1, ii. 12) and ends with two *aschrès* (xl. 5, xli. 2). A whole series of Psalms begins with אַשְׁרֵי (Pss. xxxii., xli., cxii., cxix., cxxviii.); although we must not on that account assume that there was a special kind of *Aschrè* Psalms; for Ps. xxxii. *e.g.* is a מַשְׂכִּיל, Ps. cxii. a *Hallelujah*, Ps. cxxviii. a שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת.

As regards the time when this Psalm was composed, we would lay no stress upon the fact that 2 Chron. xxii. 5 sounds like an allusion to it. But (1) it is earlier than the time of Jeremiah, for he was evidently acquainted with it; the words of blessing and of cursing in Jer. xvii. 5–8 (forming part of the discourses contained in ch. xiv.–xvii., which seem to belong to the three months' reign of Jehoiakim) are like an expository and embellishing paraphrase of it. It is a custom of Jeremiah's to reproduce predictions of his predecessors, and more especially expressions found in the Psalms, in the flow of his own discourse, and to transform their style into his own. In the case we are now considering it is an additional argument in favour of the priority of the Psalm, that Jeremiah makes the curse, which corresponds to the blessing, refer to Jehoiakim, and thus gives the Psalm an application to the circumstances of his own time. But (2) it is not earlier than the time of Solomon. For לֻצִים, a word which in the time of the Chokma was in common use as applied to the freethinkers (*vid.* the definition in Prov. xxi. 24), but which occurs only here in the whole Psalter, points to the time of Solomon onwards. Seeing, however, it contains no references whatever to contemporary events, it is vain to attempt to determine the date of its composition more precisely. We say with Columban: *Non audiendi sunt hi, qui ad excludendam Psalmorum veram expositionem falsas similitudines ab historia petitas conantur inducere.*[1]

[1] *Vid.* Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica* (1853), ii. 1065. The commentary

Vers. 1–3. As in Pss. xxxii. 2, xl. 5, and Prov. viii. 34, the exclamative אַשְׁרֵי has *Metheg* alongside of the א; in a few codices it has even a *Metheg* both to the right and to the left of the *Schebâ*, in order to indicate that the latter is vocal; for on account of the significance of the word it is to be read exceptionally *aschᵉrè*. It is the copulative form of the *pluralet.* אֲשָׁרִים (from אַשַּׁר, cog. יָשַׁר, כָּשַׁר, to go straight out, to prosper, to be rightly constituted), and always, even before light suffixes (Olsh., § 135 *c*), has the form אַשְׁרֵי, as an exclamation: O the blessedness of so and so. He who is declared to be blessed is described, first in accordance with that which he does not do, then (and this is the leading thought of the whole Psalm) in accordance with that which he does: he does not associate with the unrighteous, but holds by the revealed word of God. The רְשָׁעִים are the ungodly, those whose ethical condition is loose, without stay, who have gone, as it were, out of the grooves of true unity (stability of character), so that they are like a tempestuous, storm-tossed sea (Isa. lvii. 20 *f.*);[1] the חַטָּאִים (from the sin-

of Columban on the Psalms, provided with Irish glosses, and written in the monastery of Bobbio, is one of the treasures of the Ambrosiana.

[1] Still we must not compare רשע with רעשׁ, רגשׁ, verbal stems which are connected rather with רע, which goes back upon the root idea of crashing, *fragor*. In the two stems رمع, رمغ Arabic vindicates for רשע the primary meaning, to be slack, flaccid, as distinguished from صدق, צדק, to be hard, firm, taut, as *e.g.* رمح صدق, *i.e.* according to the Kamus رمح صلب متين مستوٍ, a hard, firm, straight lance. In his treatise on the derivatives of the stem צדק (1881) Kautzsch has disputed this primary physical signification of the word; but he has not thereby led us to give it up, for "to be in conformity with a norm" leads of necessity to such a root idea. The idea of being flaccid and loose is also transferred in the case of other words to the province of ethics; فجر, to be reckless, dissolute (*dissolutum*), is related to פֶּגֶר *cadaver quod dissolvitur*. These same two primary notions are also contrasted in the intellectual sphere: حكم, wise, literally, compact, firm, strong, solid,

gular חַטָּא, instead of which חַטֹּא is always used) are the sinners, ἁμαρτωλοί, those who pass their life in sins of deed, especially in sins that are gross and manifest to the sight; the לֵצִים (from לוּץ, like מֵת from מוּת) are the scoffers, who make the divine, the holy and the true a subject of misrepresenting and frivolous wit (as to the primary meaning of the term: *flectere*, *torquere*, *vid.* on Prov. i. 6, 22). The three designations stand alongside of one another upon the same footing; as regards their purport, however, they form a climax: *impii corde*, *peccatores opere*, *illusores ore*, in accordance with which, as regards the first, mention is made, as in Job xxi. 16, xxii. 18, of their עֵצָה (from יָעַץ, *figere*, *statuere*), their resolution, bent of will, and therefore character or disposition; as regards the second, of their דֶּרֶךְ, their way of walking, way of acting, or manner of life; and as regards the third, of their מוֹשָׁב, which, like the Arabic *meǧlis*, signifies both seat (Job xxix. 7) and assembly (Ps. cvii. 32), whether it be of an official or of a social nature (cf. Ps. xxvi. 4*f.* and Jerem xv. 17). For הָלַךְ בְּ in an ethical sense, cf. Mic. vi. 16, and Jer. vii. 24. The meaning accordingly is as follows: happy the man who does not walk in the disposition cherished by the ungodly, who is still further from associating in the vicious life of sinners, or from having delight in the society of scoffers at religion. After this prefixed negative the description now continues with כִּי אִם־[1]: but his delight is (a noun clause instead of a verbal clause), = he has delight (חֶפְצוֹ, primarily, bending = stooping, in-

and سخف, "foolish, silly," literally, "to be thin, flaccid, without stay," like a mean threadbare texture (*vid.* Fleischer's translation of Samachschari's *Goldene Halsbänder*, pp. 26, 27, note 76). Accordingly רָשָׁע means, "the man who is loose," and indeed, as an ethico-religious term, the godless man, *i.e.* he who has lost his hold of God. The Ethiopic רסח, "to be guilty, to be in the wrong, to be condemned," is merely a transliteration of רשׁע, and is of no significance etymologically.

[1] כִּי אִם־: "for if," "yea if," then, the special force of the אִם being left out of account, "on the contrary," "but."

clining; for חָפֵץ, حفض, signifies to press down, to stoop, *inclinare*, Job xl. 17) in תּוֹרַת ה׳, the teaching of Jahve, which has become Israel's *νόμος*, its rule of life; in this he absorbs himself by meditating upon it day and night (two adverbs with the old accusative endings *am*, cf. Chald. יְמָם, Samar. יוֹמָן, and *ah*, cf. אַרְצָה, earthwards and בֵּיתָה, homewards). The *perfects* in *v.* 1 describe what he all along has never done; the *imperfect* יֶהְגֶּה, what he continually busies himself with doing. הָגָה, said of a deep (cf. هجّ *depressum esse*) dull mode of utterance, hovering, as it were, between within and without, here signifies the quiet soliloquy (cf. هجس, *mussitando secum loqui*) of one who is searching and meditating. The unfolding of the אַשְׁרֵי now begins with וְהָיָה in *v.* 3. It is a consecutive preterite: in consequence of this he becomes like a tree, indeed he is thereby already like a tree, planted by waterbrooks, which yields its fruit in due season, and whose leaf does not fall off. As distinguished from נָטוּעַ, שָׁתוּל, according to *Jalkut*, § 614, signifies firmly planted, so that all the winds, should they storm upon it, cannot remove it from its place (אין מזיזין אתו ממקומו). In פַּלְגֵי מַיִם, the מַיִם as well as the plural serves to heighten the figure; according to the *Jâḳût*, פֶּלֶג (Arab. *falg'*, or פָּלֶג, Job xx. 17, Arab. *falag'*, from פלג, to divide (Job xxxviii. 25), signifies "every flowing stream, especially the brook that issues from a spring, and every channel which one leads from a spring over the surface of the ground," winter torrents (سَيْل) and great rivers, such as the Nile and the Euphrates, being excepted. The plural denotes either one brook looked at from the point of view of the abundance of its water, or even several which from different sides supply the tree with nourishing and refreshing moisture. In the relative clause the whole emphasis does not lie upon בְּעִתּוֹ (Calvin: *impii, licet præcoces fructus ostentent, nihil tamen producunt nisi abortivum*); but פִּרְיוֹ is a first, בְּעִתּוֹ a second tone-word:

the fruit, which one expects of it, it yields (equivalent to יַעֲשֶׂה elsewhere: it brings forth), and that too at its, *i.e.*, as in civ. 27 and frequently, at the appointed and appropriate time (= בְּעִתָּהּ, from עֵת = עֶנֶת, as the Assyr. *înu*, fem. *îtu* = *întu*, *intu*, proves), without ever in the course of the seasons disappointing hope. The clause וְעָלֵהוּ לֹא יִבּוֹל is the second half of the relative clause: and whose foliage does not fall off or become withered (נָבַל, like the synonymous נָבֵל, from √בל). The green foliage is an emblem of the faith which transforms the living water of the divine word into sap and force, and the fruits are emblems of the works which gradually ripen and spread blessings all around; a tree which has lost its leaves does not bring any fruit to maturity. Not till וְכֹל, where non-figurative language makes its appearance, does the person of him who loves God's law once more become the direct subject. Like the Targum, the accentuation takes this member of the verse as the third member of the relative clause; but while we can say צָלַח of a thriving plant, we cannot so use הַצְלִיחַ. This *Hiph.* (from צלח, صلح, to split, divide, go through, *pervadere*, 2 Sam. xix. 18, penetrate, xlv. 5; intrans., to be serviceable, suitable, Jer. xiii. 7) signifies causatively, to cause anything to go through or succeed (Gen. xxxix. 23); transitively, to carry out, to make suitable or in a suitable manner;[1] and intransitively, to succeed, prosper (Judg. xviii. 5). With the first signification, Jahve would be the subject; with the third, the undertaking of the righteous man; with the second, the righteous man himself. The latter is the most natural: everything that he undertakes he carries out to a happy issue (the same expression as in 2 Chron. vii. 11, xxxi. 21; Dan. viii. 24). That which a brook full of water is to the tree that is planted close beside it, the word of God is to the man who devotes himself to it: it makes him, according to his calling in life,

[1] In Arabic, *e.g.*, to make an instrument suitable, *i.e.* to tune it. *Vid.* Kosegarten, *Chrestom.*, p. 24 *f.*

ever fruitful in seasonable good works, it keeps him vigorous both inwardly and outwardly; and everything that such an one undertakes he brings to a successful issue, for the strength of the word and of the blessing of God is in all that he does.

Vers. 4–6. The ungodly (הָרְשָׁעִים with apodeictic article) are the opposite of a tree rooted by water-brooks. They are כַּמֹּץ, like the chaff (from מוּץ, to press out), which the wind drives away, viz. from the high-lying threshing floor (Isa. xvii. 13); *i.e.* they are without root below, without fruit above, without vital force and freshness, lying loose upon the threshing floor, and fleeing away, if a wind but blows; so altogether null and unstable are they. With עַל־כֵּן an inference is drawn from this ethical condition of the godless; because of this their inner nullity and instability they stand not בַּמִּשְׁפָּט. This is the name given to the judgment of just retribution, to which God subjects each and every individual without exception, with all that they have done (Eccl. xii. 14),—His righteous government, which breaks in upon the course of life of every individual as well as upon the history of the nations, and recompenses according to desert. The ungodly do not stand (קוּם, to remain standing, like עָמַד, cxxx. 3, to maintain oneself erect) in this judgment, nor sinners בַּעֲדַת צַדִּיקִים. Community (עֵדָה = *ʿîdah*, from יָעַד, נָעַד) of the righteous—such is the name given to the church of God (עֲדַת יְ׳), which, according to its divinely ordained and divinely wrought character, is a community of righteous ones (cxi. 1), to which, therefore, the unrighteous belong only externally and in appearance: *οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ* (Rom. ix. 6). The judgment of God, whensoever and wheresoever He holds it, reduces this appearance to its nullity. When the time comes for the divine decision, which separates externally that which is even already separated inwardly, viz. the unrighteous and the righteous, the chaff and the wheat, the former pass away

like chaff before a storm, and their temporary prosperity, which had no divine root, finds a dreadful end. For Jahve knoweth the way of the righteous (יוֹדֵעַ as in xxxvii. 18; Matt. vii. 23; 2 Tim. ii. 19, and freq.). What is meant is, as the Fathers say, a *nosse cum affectu et effectu*, a knowledge which stands in a living and intimate relation to its object, and is at one and the same time a turning towards it and an embracing of it in love. The way of the righteous, *i.e.* the course of their life, has God as its goal; God knows this way, which for this very reason also inevitably attains its goal. On the other hand, the way of the ungodly תֹּאבֵד; because left to itself, it perisheth, goes down to אֲבַדּוֹן, and, without attaining the goal it had in view, loses itself in dark night. In Arabic أَبِدَ means to lose oneself in the infinite (more especially in the boundless desert, which is called بَدْوٌ or بَيْدَآءُ).[1] Only the way of the righteous is דֶּרֶךְ עוֹלָם (cxxxix. 24), a way that issues in eternal life. Ps. cxii., which also begins with אַשְׁרֵי, concludes with the same fearful תאבד.

PSALM II.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HIS CHRIST, TO WHOM EVERYTHING MUST BOW.

1 Wherefore do the peoples rage,
And the nations meditate vanity!
2 The kings of the earth rise in rebellion,
And the rulers take counsel together—
Against Jahve and against His Anointed.
3 "Up! let us break their bonds asunder,
And cast away from us their cords!"

[1] The root is בד, to separate, divide, a root which appears also in the post-biblical (Midraschic) אָבַד מִן, to alienate from one.

4 He who is enthroned in the heavens laughs,
The Lord of all mocks at them.
5 Then will He speak to them in His anger,
And in His hot wrath thunder them down :
6 " — And yet have I established My King
Upon Zion, My holy hill."

(The Divine King speaks :)
7 " I will tell of a decree !
Jahve said unto Me : Thou art My Son,
I have this day begotten Thee.
8 Ask of Me, and I will give Thee nations for Thine inheritance,
And Thy possession shall be the ends of the earth.
9 Thou shalt break them with a sceptre of iron,
Like a potter's vessel Thou shalt dash them in pieces."

10 And now, ye kings, show yourselves wise ;
Be admonished, ye judges of the earth !
11 Serve Jahve with reverence,
And rejoice with trembling.
12 Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish,
For His anger may easily be kindled—
Blessed are all they that take refuge in Him.

The didactic Ps. i., which begins with אַשְׁרֵי, is now followed by a prophetical Psalm, which closes with the same word. In other respects also it coincides with Ps. i., but still more so with Psalms of the earlier regal period (lix. 9, lxxxiii. 3–9), and with the prophetical style of Isaiah. The rebellion of the allied nations and their rulers against Jahve and His Anointed One will be dashed to pieces when it comes into collision with the invincible, world-conquering imperial power, which Jahve has lent to His King established upon Zion, His Son. This is the fundamental thought, which is worked out with the vivid directness of dramatic representation. Words of the singer and seer begin and end the Psalm. The rebels, and Jahve and His Anointed, appear speaking for themselves upon the scene ; the framework, however, is formed by words of the author, which, like the chorus of the Greek drama, give expression to the reflections and emo-

tions suggested by what has been seen and heard. It is not a purely lyric poem that we have before us. The ego of the poet falls into the background. The Anointed of God who speaks in the middle of the Psalm is not the anonymous poet himself. But whether it is a king of the present, who is regarded here in the light of Messianic promise, or that King of the future, in whom the world-calling of the Davidic kingdom is one day to be fulfilled:—at all events this Anointed of God comes upon the scene invested with all the divine power and glory, in which the Messiah appears in the prophets.

The Psalm is anonymous. For this very reason we must neither make David (Hofm.) nor Solomon (Ew.) its author, for seeing that in the New Testament "hymn of David" and "Psalm" are synonymous terms, nothing is to be inferred from Acts iv. 25; and it is far more hazardous to ascribe an anonymous Psalm to David or Solomon than to deny the direct Davidic or Salomonic authorship of one that is entitled לדוד or לשלמה. But neither is David (Kurtz) nor Solomon (Bleek) the subject of the Psalm. It might possibly be David; for during his reign there occurs at least one coalition of the nations similar to that which forms the occasion of our Psalm (*vid.* 2 Sam. x. 6); on the other hand it cannot be Solomon; for during his reign, which was troubled only towards its close (1 Kings xi. 14 *ff.*), no such event took place; we should rather be under the necessity of inferring it from this Psalm, if Bleek's conjecture were right. We might rather guess at Uzziah (Meier) or Hezekiah (Maurer), both of whom received the kingdom in a weak condition, and found the neighbouring nations broken loose from their allegiance to the house of David. In either case the situation of the Psalm would be in keeping; for the rebellious peoples that are brought before us have hitherto been subject to Jahve and His Anointed. But the Psalm contains no reference to contemporary events that might

support either the one conjecture or the other. If the Anointed of God, who begins to speak in *v.* 7, were the psalmist himself, we should know at least that the Psalm has as its author a king full of a lofty Messianic self-consciousness. But the dramatic movement of the Psalm up to the following ועתה of *v.* 10 is opposed to such an identification of the Anointed of God with the author. And that Alexander Jannæus, that bloodthirsty despot, who was most justly hated, and who inaugurated his reign with fratricide, was both at once (Hitzig)—this is a conjecture that turns the religious and ethical character of the Psalm into an odious falsehood. The Old Testament knows of no kingship to which world-dominion was promised and to which sonship was ascribed (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 28) save the Davidic. The Psalm celebrates the world-dominion of a king who is a son of David and a Son of God. The occurrences of his time, which determined the mood of the poet, are no longer clear to us. From these occurrences, however, he is transported in thought into the very middle of those commotions among the nations, which issue in their all becoming the kingdoms of God and of His Christ (Apoc. xi. 15, xii. 10).

In the New Testament this Psalm is cited more frequently than any other. According to Acts iv. 25–28, *vv.* 1 and 2 have found their fulfilment in the hostile alliance of Israel and the Gentiles against Jesus, the holy servant of God, and His confessors. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Pss. cx. and ii. stand upon the same footing; the former as a testimony to the eternal priesthood of Jesus after the order of Melchizedek, the latter as a testimony to His Sonship above the angels. In Acts xiii. 33 (cf. Rom. i. 4) Paul teaches how the "to-day" is to be understood. According to its real fulfilment, the "to-day" is the day of the resurrection of Jesus. Born from the dead into the life at God's right-hand, He upon this day, which the Church accordingly calls *dies rega-*

his, entered upon His eternal Kingship. The New Testament echo of this Psalm, however, goes still further and deeper. The two names for the coming One, which were current in the time of Jesus, viz. ὁ *Χριστός* and ὁ *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* (John i. 50, Matt. xxvi. 13,—in the mouth of Nathanael and the high priest) refer back to this Psalm and to Dan. ix. 25, just as the title ὁ *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* indisputably refers back to Ps. viii. 5 and to Dan. ix. 13. When de Wette and Hupfeld maintain that the Psalm does not fit in with the Christian notions of the Messiah, it almost seems as if these ought to be estimated, not in accordance with the language of the Apostles, but in conformity with academic dogmatic assertions. In the Apocalypse indeed (xix. 15, xii. 5) Jesus appears exactly as the Psalm represents Him, as *ποιμαίνων τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ*. The office of the Messiah is not only that of one who brings salvation, but also that of one who is a judge. Redemption is the beginning and judgment the end of His work. It is to this end that the Psalm points. In the Gospels our Lord Himself frequently refers to the fact, that besides the sceptre of peace and the shepherd's staff, He bears also the rod of iron (Matt. xxiv. 50*f.*, xxi. 44; Luke xix. 27). The day of His Parousia is indeed a day of judgment—the great day of the *ὀργὴ τοῦ ἀρνίου* (Apoc. vi. 17), before which the languid Messianic creations of rationalistic exegetes will pass away in exactly the same way as did the carnal Messianic hopes of the Jews before His first appearing.

Vers. 1–3. The Psalm begins with a strophe of seven lines dominated by an interrogative "Wherefore." The malicious undertaking is self-condemned. It is groundless and resultless. This certainty is expressed with a tinge of indignant astonishment in the question. With the following preterite לָמָּה inquires as to the ground of that which has so lawlessly taken place: wherefore have peoples so tumultuously assembled (Aq.: *ἐθορυβήθησαν*)? and with the following

impf., as to the aim of that which is going on so resultlessly: to what end do they meditate vanity? רִיק might be adverbial and equivalent to לָרִיק; here, however, as in iv. 3, it is a governed accusative; for הָגָה, which by itself only signifies the quiet inward musing and devising (here, as in xxxviii. 13, of something deceitful) which expresses itself in a soft, dull manner, requires an object. The indignant astonishment of the question justifies itself in this רִיק: to what end so vain a thing, a thing *i.e.* so irrational and so inconsistent? For the singer, himself a subject and member of the divine kingdom, knows Jahve and His Anointed One too well, not to recognize beforehand the unjustifiable and impotent character of such a rebellion.[1] That both these are aimed at is stated in *v.* 2, which, without being subordinated to the למה, carries out the description of the position of affairs. The *impf.* describes that which is going on at present: they set themselves in position, assume a defiant attitude (הִתְיַצֵּב, as in 1 Sam. xvii. 16). After the *impf.* a transition is again made to the *perf.* (cf. the converse order in lxxxiii. 6), the more colourless expression of a simple matter of fact: נוֹסַד (with יַחַד, as an exponent of reciprocity), literally, to press densely and firmly upon one another, then, like سَاوَدَ, which in its signification, *clam cum aliquo locutus est*, starts from the same primary meaning of pressing closely: to take counsel together in a confidential manner (as in xxxi. 14; *cf.*

[1] Ley calls *v.* 1 a hexameter, because, according to him, it contains six accentual rises (*viz.* if one erases the *makkef* of יהנו־ריק). Bickell scans it trochaically: *Lámma rág'šu gójim Ul'ummím jeh | gú rik* (in which the initial ולא is clipped). In *v.* 2 Ley succeeds in bringing out a hexameter only by allowing the four *makkefs* to stand and by attaching ורוזנים to the first half of the hexameter. In a more satisfactory way than either of these, Neteler (*Anfang der hebr. Metrik der Psalmen*, 1871) finds five feet in *v.* 1: – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ | – – ⏑ – – ⏑. But even here the symmetry of the "Iambic metre" cannot be brought out without an alteration of the text: לְאֻמָּה is changed into לְאֻמָּה with the accent on the last syllable

נוֹעֵי, lxxi. 10). Besides גּוֹיִם we have also לְאֻמִּים, with which may be compared the Assyrian *li-i-mu* as the name of a family or tribe, and besides the kings of the earth, רוֹזְנִים, after the Arabic *razuna* (to be heavy): the men of weight and dignity, *σεμνοί, augusti*. It is a general rebellion of the Gentile world against Jahve and His מְשִׁיחַ, *Χριστός*, the King consecrated by Him by means of holy oil and most intimately allied with Him. In *v.* 3 the singer hears the resolution come to by the conferring princes. The pathetic suffix *êmō* instead of *êhém* refers back to Jahve and His Anointed. The cohortatives express their mutual encouragement of one another; the sound and rhythm of their exclamation correspond to their sullen animosity and threatening defiance: the rhythm is iambic and then anapæstic. They will first break asunder their fetters (מוֹסְרוֹת = מֹאסְרוֹת, from וזר, common Arabic وزر = אזר, ازر), to which the אֶת, which is significant in the poetical style, points; then they will cast away the cords from them (מִמֶּנּוּ, *a nobis*, the Palestinian mode of writing, whereas the Babylonian Jews said and wrote מִמֵּנּוּ *a nobis* as distinguished from מִמֶּנּוּ *ab eo; Sota*, 35*a*) with the anger of men that are bound and at the same time with the triumph of men that are set free. They are, therefore, at the time of their rebellion subjects of Jahve and His Anointed; and that not merely because the whole world belongs to Jahve, but also because He has enabled His Anointed to obtain dominion over them. It is a contest for freedom upon which they are entering; a freedom, however, which is hostile to God.

Vers. 4–6. Above this theatre of the wild hurly burly of war and high-handed arrogance the singer in this strophe of six lines beholds Jahve, and in spirit hears His words of thunder against the rebels. In contrast to the potentates of earth and the events that take place there Jahve is called יוֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם: in unapproachable majesty and eternal glory He is enthroned above them; He is called אֲדֹנָי as being the One

who, with absolute freedom and in accordance with the plan of His wisdom which cannot be frustrated, overrules whatever takes place below. The imperfects state, not what He will do, but what He is continually doing (cf. Isa. xviii. 4*f.*); according to lix. 9, xxxvii. 13, לָמוֹ also belongs to יִשְׂחָק (from שׂחק, the more common word in the post-pentateuchal language, = צחק). He laughs at the defiant ones; for between Him and them there is an infinite contrast; He derides them by allowing the infinite folly of the infinitely small one to reach a climax, when He hurls him undeceived down to the ground. This climax, the extreme point of the divine patience, is fixed, as in Deut. xxix. 19, by אָז (*cf.* שָׁם in xiv. 5, xxxvi. 13),—a "then" which refers to the future and points to the crisis which will then occur. Then, all at once, He begins to use the practical language of wrath to His foes, and in His hot rage throws them into a state of consternation, disconcerts them both inwardly and outwardly. בָּהַל, נבל, as well as בָּלַהּ, בָּלַע and the Syriac *balhi* as a *quadriliterum*, means originally, to set free, let go, then in Hebrew sometimes, to overthrow externally, and sometimes, to confound and disconcert internally. *V.* 5*a* is like a peal of thunder (cf. Isa. x. 33), בְּחֲרוֹנוֹ, 5*b*, like the flashing lightning, יְבַהֲלֵמוֹ (with *ēmo* from *himu* as in v. 11, xxi. 10, lxxxiii. 12, 14), like the echo of the thunder. And just as the first strophe closed with words of the rebels, so this second one closes with Jahve's own words. As in Gen. xv. 2, xviii. 13, Ps. l. 17, a circumstantial clause begins with וַאֲנִי. The suppressed principal clause (cf. Isa. iii. 14; Ew., § 341 *c*) is easily supplied: ye are rising in rebellion, whilst notwithstanding I . . . . With וַאֲנִי He sets His irresistible omnipotent will over against their vain undertaking. Böttcher has proved that we must not translate: "I have anointed" (Targ., Symm.);[1]

[1] In its explanation of נסכתי the Jalkut to the Psalms, § 620, vacillates between אמשחתיה, "I have anointed him" (after Dan. x. 3),

and in opposition to Hupfeld this is acknowledged also by Riehm. נָסַךְ, نسك, undoubtedly means to pour out, not, however, to pour over or upon; and the signification, to pour out broadly and firmly (*e.g.* of casting metal, libation, pouring out ointment), then passes over, as in הֵצִיק, הֵצִיג, into that of setting up firmly (a meaning that can be traced also in Assyrian),[1] here, of appointing or investing (LXX., Syr., Luth.), so that נָסִיךְ (Assyr. *nasik*), as a name for prince, is not to be compared with מָשִׁיחַ, but with נָצִיב. After רַבִּיתִי (*unxi*) the Targum rightly inserts וּמְנִיתֵיהּ (*et præfeci eum*), for עַל־צִיּוֹן is not the place where the kings were anointed. History does not know of a king of Israel who was anointed on Mount Zion. Zion is mentioned as the royal seat of the Anointed One; there he has been installed, in order that he may reign there, and rule from thence (cx. 2). What is meant is the rising ground of the City of David (2 Sam. v. 7, 9; 1 Kings viii. 1), including Mount Moriah. That hill of holiness, *i.e.* holy hill, which is the abiding-place of the divine presence and therefore towers above all the heights of the earth, has been assigned to him as his royal seat.

Vers. 7–9. The Anointed One himself now begins to speak, and announces what he is, and what he can effect, in virtue of a divine decree. No word of transition, no formula of introduction, marks this sudden passage from the words of Jahve to those of His Christ; the singer is a seer: his Psalm

אתיכתיה, "I have cast, moulded him" (after Ex. xxxii. 4 and freq.), and גדלתיו "I have made him great" (after Mic. v. 4). Aquila and Quinta, by translating it *καὶ ἐδιασάμην* (from *διάζεσθαι* = *ὑφαίνειν*), a translation which the *orditus sum* of Jerome follows (נסך = نسج, to weave), add a fourth possibility. A fifth possibility: נָסַךְ, to purify, consecrate (Hitz. in his Commentary on the Psalms, 1863, in opposition to his own explanation of the term in his Commentary on Proverbs, 1858, p. 77), does not exist; for the Arabic *nasaka* acquires this signification from the primary meaning, to clear of mud, etc., to wash away (*e.g.* to wash away the saline particles of a field).

[1] Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien* (1874), p. 7.

is a reflexion of what he has seen, an echo of what he has heard. Just as Jahve, in opposition to the rebels, acknowledges the King upon Zion; so, in opposition to the same rebels, the King upon Zion appeals to Him. The divine name יְהוָה has *Rebia magnum;* and, in consequence of the strength of the comprehensive intonation of this accent, it has also *Gaja* by the *Schebâ* (cf. אֱלֹהַי xxv. 2, אֱלֹהִים lxviii. 8, אֲדֹנָי xc. 1). The construction of סִפֵּר with אֶל (as in lxix. 27; cf. אמר Gen. xx. 2; Jer. xxvii. 19; דִּבֶּר 2 Chron. xxxii. 19, הודיע Isa. xxxviii. 19): to give an account or to make an announcement with regard to . . ., is circumstantial and consequently solemn. Self-assured and void of fear, he can and will oppose to those, who now renounce their allegiance to him, a חֹק, *i.e.* an authentic inviolable decree, which cannot be changed or shaken. Aq., Theod., and Jerome translate אל חק: "the decree of a strong one," as if such a collocation of words was possible in Hebrew.[1] Nor may we read together חק and יהוה; אֶל חָק has rightly *Olewejored.* It is the amplificative use of the noun which is not more precisely determined (a use which is quite common in Arabic grammar): a decree, and such an one. A grand decree both as regards its author and its purport. Jahve has declared to him: בְּנִי אַתָּה,[2] and that too upon the very day upon which He has begotten or born him into this filial relationship. The verb יָלַד (whence יְלִדְתִּיךָ; *vid. Gesenius-Kautzsch*, § 44, remark 2), like וָלַד and γεννᾶν, combines the meanings, to beget, and to bear (LXX. γεγέννηκα, Aq. ἔτεκον), whereas הוֹלִיד, אָבָה, is said only of the father; what is meant is, as in the case of ἀπεκύησεν in Jas. i. 18, an operation of divine power that tran-

[1] Cf. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 281.

[2] Nothwithstanding the *Athnach*, אַתָּה remains here, as in xxv. 7, xl. 18, lxx. 6, without a lengthened *ā*; but the word has become *Milel;* whereas, according to Ben-Ascher it is *Milra*, when out of pause. By Ben-Naftali, however, it is accented upon the *penult*, even when out of pause (as in lxxxix. 10, 12, xc. 2).

scends both, and indeed, seeing it is his installation (נסך) into the kingship that is treated of, the begetting of him into a condition of royal existence, a begetting that took place in and with the act of anointing (משׁח).[1] Whether David, or a son of David, or the second David is meant, in any case 2 Sam. vii. must be regarded as the first and earliest announcement of this חק. For there David, with a glance back at his anointing and at the same time with the promise of everlasting dominion, receives the witness of the eternal filial relationship into which Jahve has put David's seed with Himself as Father, so that he and his seed can say to Jahve, אָבִי אַתָּה (lxxxix. 27), just as Jahve says to him, בְּנִי אַתָּה. From this filial relationship of the Anointed One to Jahve, the Creator and Owner of the world, flows the former's right to, and expectation of, universal dominion. שְׁאַל is followed by a cohortative, which is appropriate after such an invitation (Ges., § 128, 1). Jahve has destined the sovereignty of the world for His Son; on the part of the latter, therefore, there is required only the desire to appropriate to himself that which has been set apart for him. He needs only to be willing; and that he is so is evident from the circumstance that, in opposition to the rebels, he appeals to Jahve's commission. This commission has the appendage contained in *v.* 9, which

[1] A Moslem tradition says, that the doctrine of the Son of God rests upon the falsifying of a single letter by the Christians. In Ps. ii. (according to this tradition) it is not said وَلَدْتُ, as the Christians read, but وُلِدْتُ, not *genui*, but *produxi* (*effeci ut nascereris*); *vid.* Fleischer, *Catal. Codd. Lips.*, p. 344. In Hebrew, however, יָלַד is said only of the midwife. The Targum renders: בְּרִיתָךְ (*creavi te*). Just as the noun בן goes back upon בנה (Assyrian *bâni*, builder = begetter, creator), so בר goes back upon ברא (ברה). Assyrian puts it beyond doubt that בר differs from בן, not only phonetically (as the Aramaic תְּרִין, two, differs from שְׁנַיִם) but also radically; for in it the synonym of בן (*bin bini*, son's son, grandchild) is *nibru* (*vid.* Fried. Delitzsch, *ut supra*, p. 142 *f.*).

is fraught with terror to the rebels. The suffixes refer to the principal term in *v.* 8, the גּוֹיִם, the ἔθνη, which are sunk in heathenism. For these his royal sceptre (cx. 2) becomes a rod of iron, which breaks them like a potter's vessel (Jer. xix. 11), which is of itself already fragile, into a thousand fragments.[1] רָעַע (=רָצַץ *frangere*) alternates with נָפַץ. The *impf.* of the former is תָּרֹעַ; instead of which the LXX. (Syr., Jerome), which translates ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ (as in 1 Cor. iv. 21) σιδηρᾷ, vocalises it תִּרְעֵם, from רָעָה. The rod of iron, according to the Hebrew text the instrument of penal authority, is thus transformed with reference to שֵׁבֶט as the shepherd's staff (xxiii. 4; Mic. vii. 14) into the instrument of despotism.

Vers. 10–12. The poet closes with a practical application to the great ones of the earth of what he has seen and heard. With וְעַתָּה, καὶ νῦν (1 John ii. 28), *itaque*, conclusions that one should apply to one's self are drawn from a general ethical (*e.g.* Prov. v. 7) or religious fact (*e.g.* Isa. xxviii. 22) that has already been stated. The exhortation is addressed, not to those who have been beheld in a state of rebellious excitement, but, in view of what has been prophetically seen and heard, to kings in general. שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ (cxlviii. 11; Prov. viii. 16; cf. Job. ix. 24) are not those who judge the earth, but the judges, *i.e.* rulers (Amos ii. 3; cf. i. 8), who belong to the earth in all its length and breadth. The *Hiph.* הִשְׂכִּיל means to show intelligence or insight; the *Niph.* נוֹסַר, as a so-called *Ni. tolerativum*, to allow one's self to be chastised or corrected, like נוֹעַץ (Prov. xiii. 10), to allow one's self to be advised, נִדְרַשׁ (Ezek. xiv. 3), to allow one's self to be sought, נִמְצָא (1 Chron. xxviii. 9 and freq.), to allow one's

[1] Compare the Cylinder inscription of Sargon II., in the beginning of which he calls himself the king that broke in pieces all lands like earthen vessels (*kima ḫaṣbâti*). Instead of this, the parallel passage in Khors. 14 has *karpâniš*, "after the manner of earthenware" (*vid.* the edition of D. G. Lyon, pp. 3, 14).

self to be found. This general call to reflection is followed, in *v.* 11, by a special exhortation with reference to Jahve, and in *v.* 12, with reference to the Son. עִבְדוּ and גִּילוּ answer to one another. The latter is not to be taken, after Hosea x. 5, in the sense of חִילוּ (xcvi. 9), with which it has the same primary meaning of moving in a circle; but, seeing that "quake with trembling" (Hitz.) is a tautology, and as an imperative גִּילוּ has everywhere else the meaning "rejoice," it is to be taken, after c. 2, in the sense of an ecstatic manifestation of joy on account of the happiness and the honour conferred upon them, in their being permitted to be the servants of such a God. The translation of the LXX.: *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ*, is correct. The בְּ is the *beth* of the accompaniment, viz., as in Zeph. iii. 17, of the accompanying emotion. What is meant is *horror honoris*, mixed with *tremor amoris* (cf. Heb. xii. 28 *f.*). The second exhortation, which now follows, and which refers to the attitude of the kings and judges to God's Anointed, has been variously interpreted. As if blinded by its clearness, all the ancient versions, with the exception of the Peschito (so far as נשקו ברא is its original rendering),[1] have missed its meaning, inasmuch as they render בַּר either בֹּר, purity, chastity, discipline (LXX., Syro-hexapl., Targ., Itala, Vulg.) or בָּר, clean, pure (Aq., Symm., Jerome: *adorate pure*); the former interpretation (as an accusative of the object: בר=תורה) is proposed also in *Bereschith rabba*, c. 10, and in *Sanhedrin*, 92 *a*. So also Hitzig: "submit yourselves to duty" (בָּר like the Arabic *birr* = בִּר); Olshausen conjectures that there is a mistake in the בר; and Hupfeld, in the translation prefixed to his notes, renders בּוֹ instead of בר: "submit to him." But all this is unexampled Hebrew. The correction suggested by Grätz, הַחֲזִיקוּ בַּמּוּסָר, is Hebrew; but the usage of the language and in conjunction

[1] Like the Syro-hexapl. the *Cod. Ambrosianus* has ⟨ܠܐ ܬܗܘ ⟩ after the *δράξασθε παιδείας* of the LXX.; cf. קבלו מרדותא (instead of אחודו) in Aphraates, 321, 6.

with it the uniform leading thought of the Psalm demand the *osculamini filium* which he finds "unintelligible," and to which v. Orelli (*Die alttest. Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreichs*, 1882, p. 179) rightly adheres. The *Piel* נִשֵּׁק signifies to kiss, and nowhere anything else. And whereas in Hebrew בַּר signifies purity and nothing else, and an instance of בַּר as an adverb, *pure*, cannot be adduced, here, after Jahve has acknowledged His Anointed One as His Son, nothing is more natural than that בַּר (in Aramaic, and probably also in Phœnician, alternating with בַּן, and once, Prov. xxxi. 2, even inflected בְּרִי = בְּנִי), the occurrence of which is not surprising in a solemn adddress, and which in this case, as Böhl and Baethgen (the latter following Möller in Rosenmüller) remark, avoids the dissonance of בֵּן פֶּן, should, in the same absolute manner as חֹק, 7 *a*, denote the unique son, and that too the Son of God.[1] The exhortation to submit themselves to Jahve is followed, as Aben Ezra already remarks, by the admonition to pay homage to Jahve's Son. Kissing is equivalent to paying homage, a sense which is now made out also for the Assyrian *našaḳ*[2] (*D. M. Z.*, xxviii. 5). Samuel kisses Saul (1 Sam. x. 1), saying that he

[1] בר is either used, in consequence of *v.* 7, after the manner of a proper name (Baethgen), or the indetermination comes under the point of view of that which, because it combines with it the idea of the majestic, the great, the supernatural, is called by the Arabian Grammarians التنكير لتعظيم or لتكثير or لتهويل; it gives free play to the imagination, seeing that it denotes a person or thing, not in accordance with their real essential nature, but in accordance with the idea that becomes apparent. An Arabic expositor would explain it thus: "kiss a son, and such a son!" (*vid. Ibn Hischâm* in de Sacy's *Anthol. grammat.* p. ٨٥, where we must translate, *hic est vir, qualis vir!*). Similarly בְּיָד, Isa. xxviii. 2, by means of a hand, viz. God's almighty hand, which is the hand of hands; and כְּמִפְנֵי־חֶרֶב, Isa. xxxi. 8, before a sword, viz. the divine sword against which there is no means of defence. Cf. also notes on Prov. xxi. 12.

[2] Whence the historical tense *iššiḳ* or *unaššiḳ*: he kissed (my feet), = he paid homage (to me).

thereby pays him homage. The subject of what follows is now, however, not the Son, but Jahve. To the New Testament consciousness, the reference of פֶּן־יֶאֱנַף to the Son is certainly at least equally natural (*vid.* Apoc. vi. 16 *f.*); and seeing that the warning against putting one's trust (חַסּוֹת) in princes (cxviii. 9, cxlvi. 3) cannot be applied to the Christ of God, the reference of the בּוֹ to Him (Hengst.) cannot be regarded as impossible. Seeing, however, that חָסָה בְּ is the usual expression for betaking oneself in faith to Jahve, and the future day of wrath appears throughout the whole of the Old Testament (*e.g.* cx. 5) as the day of the wrath of God, we make the *ne irascatur* refer to Him whose Son the Anointed One is. He who does not honour the Son does not honour the Father (John v. 23); and accordingly the admonition: pay homage to him, the Son, goes forth along with the warning: lest Jahve be angry, and ye perish דֶּרֶךְ. This דֶּרֶךְ is the accusative of more exact definition. If any one's way תֹּאבַד (i. 6), he himself is lost in respect of his way, seeing that it leads him down into the abyss. It is questionable whether כִּמְעַט means "in a little" in the sense of *brevi* or *facile*. The usage of the language is in favour of the latter (Hupf.). For everywhere else כִּמְעַט by itself (without such additions as in Ezra ix. 8; Isa. xxvi. 20; Ezek. xvi. 47) means "in a little, almost, easily." At least after hypothetical protases (as in lxxxi. 15; 2 Sam. xix. 37; Job xxxii. 22) this meaning is secured to it. We must therefore render it: for His wrath might easily be kindled. For the collocation of words, cf. lxxiii. 2. The poet warns the rulers for their own highest good not to summon forth the jealous wrath of Jahve in behalf of His Christ, which according to *v.* 4 is unavoidable. Happy are they who have nothing to fear from this outbreak of wrath, because they hide themselves in Jahve as their refuge. The construct חוֹסֵי unites בּוֹ with itself, without being in the genitive, so as to form but one term (*vid.* Ges., § 116, 1). חָסָה, the usual word for betaking

one's self in faith to Jahve, means primarily *refugere, confugere* (*vid.* Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, under חוּשׂ); along with ב it expresses the idea of hiding one's self in him, to whom one has resort.[1]

PSALM III.

THE MORNING HYMN OF ONE WHO IS IN DISTRESS, BUT WHO ENCOURAGES HIMSELF IN GOD.

2 Jahve, how many are mine adversaries!
Many rise up against me,
3 Many say of my soul,
"There is no salvation for him in God" (*Selah*).

4 But Thou, Jahve, art a shield about me,
My glory, and the lifter up of mine head.
5 I cry aloud unto Jahve,
And He answereth me from His holy hill (*Selah*).

6 I laid me down, and slept—
I have awaked, for Jahve sustaineth me.
7 I am not afraid of myriads of people,
That have encamped against me round about.

8 Arise, Jahve; help me, my God!
For Thou smitest all mine enemies upon the cheek bone,
The teeth of the ungodly Thou dost break.
9 To Jahve belongeth salvation—
Thy blessing be upon Thy people! (*Selah*).

[1] Wetzstein remarks that Arabic still has حسا (حسى) in its primary reference to water, which flows, withdrawn from sight and hidden, under the sand, and which only comes to sight by means of digging; the rocky bottom, upon which it collects itself beneath the sandy surface, and whereby it is prevented from leaking or evaporating, is called حسى *ḥasâ*, or حسى *ḥisâ*, the place of concealment or protection, and a well dug there is called عين الحسى. *Vid.* however, Fleischer on Isa. iv. 6 (3rd edition). The Assyrian *ḫasû*, which signifies to run, hasten, confirms us in adhering to the above meaning of the Hebrew word, viz. to run somewhere (in order to be hidden). From *ḫasû* we have *ḫassîtu*, prayer (which seeks a place of refuge), synonymous with *têšlitu* and *sullû* (from סלה, *Piel* to beg, invoke, perhaps originally to lift up, viz. the hands).

The two prologue Psalms, which treat of a kindred theme, the one ethically from the standpoint of the חכמה, the other in connection with the history of redemption and from the standpoint of the נבואה, are now followed by a morning prayer; for morning and evening prayers are what one most naturally expects to find in a prayer and hymn-book. The morning hymn, Ps. iii., which agrees with Ps. ii. in making mention of the "holy hill," naturally precedes the evening hymn, Ps. iv.; for the opinion held by some expositors that Ps. iii. is an evening hymn rests upon a grammatical misconception.

With Ps. iii. begin the hymns that are expressly stated to have been arranged for music. By מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד, *a Psalm of David* (intentionally with לְ, in order to give prominence to the indeterminateness of the first member, like *e.g.* مَثَلٌ لِلْعَرَبِ "a proverb of the Arabs"), the following hymn is characterised as one intended for musical accompaniment. Seeing that מִזְמוֹר occurs only in the Psalm-titles, it is probably a technical term coined by David. The verb זָמַר (√זם) is an onomatopoetic word (Hupf.), which in the *Kal* signifies to pinch off, and indeed to prune (the vines) or lop off (cf. the Arab. زَبَرَ, to write, from the humming sound of the style or reed upon the writing material). The signification, to sing and play, which belongs to the *Piel*, is not connected with this signification, to pinch or nip. For, seeing that cæsura and syllable are not notions of natural growth, neither the idea of dividing rhythmically (Schultens) nor that of speaking articulately (Hitz.), for which the advance of the Ethiopic *zamara* from "singing" to "proclaiming" affords no evidence, supplies us with a probable means whereby the latter signification passed over into the former. Nor does the plucking of the strings (Böttch., Ges.), for which the language has coined the term נָגַן (from the same root as נָגַע *tangere, pulsare fides*). To this we must add, that the earliest

passages, in which זִמְרָה and זָמַר occur (Ex. xv. 2; Judg. v. 3), speak rather of singing than of playing, and both words frequently denote the former as distinguished from the latter (*e.g.* xcviii. 5, lxxxi. 3; cf. Cant. ii. 12). Besides, if זָמַר, like *ψάλλειν*, originally meant *carpere* (*pulsare*) *fides*, such names of instruments as the Arab *zemr*, hautboy, and *zummâra*, pipe, would not have been formed. No; as Hupfeld has shown, זָמַר, as being a direct onomatopoetic word, signifies, like *canere*, "to make music" in the widest sense (cf. Curtius sub. v. *σύριγξ*); the more exact usage of the language, however, distinguishes between זָמַר and שִׁיר, as "to play," and "to sing." With בְּ instrumental, זָמַר signifies, to sing with a musicala ccompaniment (like the Ethiopic ዘመረ, *instrumento canere*); and זִמְרָה (Aram. זְמָר) is occasionally, as in Amos v. 23, directly music, melody. Accordingly מִזְמוֹר signifies technically, the piece of music, and שִׁיר (probably cognate in root with سير, cord, as being that which is drawn out), the words of the song. And therefore we translate the former by "Psalm"; for *ὁ ψαλμός ἐστιν*, says Gregory of Nyssa (i. 295, *ed. Paris.*) *ἡ διὰ τοῦ ὀργάνου τοῦ μουσικοῦ μελῳδία, ᾠδὴ δὲ ἡ διὰ στόματος γενομένη* (Corderius rightly: *γινομένη*) *τοῦ μέλους μετὰ ῥημάτων ἐπιφώνησις.*

That Ps. iii. is a hymn arranged for music, is evident also from the סֶלָה that occurs here three times. As Bruno has already correctly counted, it is found 71 times in the Psalter (17 times in Book I., 30 times in Book II., 20 times in Book III., 4 times in Book V.) and, with the exception of the anonymous Pss. lxvi. and lxvii., only in such as bear on their front the name of David and of the singers who were renowned from his time. That it is a note referring to the Davidic temple-music is evident from this, that almost all the Psalms with סלה have also לַמְנַצֵּחַ, which refers to the musical execution. To this there are only eleven exceptions (viz. iii., vii., xxiv., xxxii., xlviii., l., lxxxii., lxxxiii., lxxxvii., lxxxix., cxliii.), and even in the case of eight of these (the exceptions being vii.,

xxxii., lxxxix.) it is at least indicated in the designation מִזְמוֹר that they were meant to be accompanied by music. The *tefilla* of Habakkuk (ch. iii.), the only portion of Scripture in which סלה occurs outside the Psalter, has the למנצח exceptionally at the end. Including the three occurrences of סלה in this *tefilla*, the word is found no less than 74 times in the Old Testament. Coming now to the meaning of this *Nota Bene*, (1) every explanation that regards it as an abbreviation, the best of which makes it stand for סֹב לְמַעְלָה הַשֵּׁר (O singer, turn thyself on high, *i.e.* back to the beginning; and therefore equivalent to *da capo*), is to be rejected for this reason, that there is no other example of such an abbreviation in the Old Testament. (2) The derivation from שָׂלָה (= סָלָה) *silere*, according to which it marks a pause, or calls upon the singers to remain silent, while the music strikes in, is inadmissible on this account, that סֶלָה in this signification is neither Hebrew nor Aramaic, and more especially because in Hebrew itself the interchange of שׂ and ס (שִׂרְיוֹן and סִרְיוֹן) is exceedingly rare. There is only one verbal stem with which סֶלָה may be combined, viz. סָלַל or סָלָה (סָלָא). The primary meaning of this stem is that of raising aloft, from which, having regard to the derivatives סֻלָּם, ladder, and מְסִלָּה in the sense of steps or stairs (2 Chron. ix. 11), we obtain for סֶלָה in general the meaning of a lifting up of the music. When the tradition contained in the Mischna takes it to be a synonym of נֶצַח, and the Targum, Quinta, Sexta, Aquila (though not always) and the Syriac (six times) accordingly translate it "for ever, always," in favour of which rendering even Jerome (in his *Ep. ad Marcellam* "*quid sit Sela*") ultimately decides,[1] the original musical signification

[1] By what etymological process this apprehension of סֶלָה in the sense of נֶצַח was brought about remains obscure; was it perhaps by means of the notion of that which rises aloft in a zigzag fashion? In Assyrian *ullûtu* means eternity, *ištu ulla*, from everlasting, adj. *ullânu*, eternal, adv. *ullûtiš* (all traceable back to the stem עלה, to be high).

is transformed into a corresponding logical or lexical one. That the musical signification, however, amounts to a strengthening of some kind or other, is shown by the διάψαλμα of the LXX. (Symm., Theod., Syriac MSS. of the Psalms); for according to its formation (*-μα = -μενον*), διάψαλμα does not signify the pause, as a cessation of the psalmody, as Gregory of Nyssa defines it: *ἡ μεταξὺ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας γινομένη κατὰ τὸ ἀθρόον ἐπηρέμησις πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ θεόθεν ἐπικρινομένου νοήματος*, but either the interlude, primarily that of the stringed instruments, just as according to Hesychius διαύλιον (διαύλειον) signifies the interlude of the flutes between the choruses (cf. *pause* in the Mysteries, = filling up with music during the dumb show), or strengthened playing, just as διαψάλλειν τριγώνοις occurs in a fragment of the comic poet Eupolis, preserved in Athenæus, of the energetic playing of the triangular harp. It probably signifies the former; for the earliest instrumental accompaniment of singing consisted of a prelude (*φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν ἀείδειν*), an interlude recurring at certain intervals, and an after-piece; διάψαλμα is in all likelihood the designation of that interlude.[1] Vocalised as the word now is, it is a noun סֶל with the *ah* of direction (kindred in meaning with גָּוָה, up! Job xxii. 29); for the omission of *Daghesh* along with the *ah* of direction is not without example elsewhere (cf. 1 Kings ii. 40, גַּתָּה, another reading for גָּתָּה, and also Ezek. viii. 2, at the end of the verse), and the ־ before ־, when there is only a virtual doubling, is also common where the letter that should have *Daghesh* is not a guttural, but a liquid; *e.g.* פַּדָּנָה (Gen. xxviii. 2), חָרָה (Gen. xiv. 10), כַּרְמֶלָּה (1 Sam. xxv. 5), for *paddanna*, *harra*, *carmilla*. From the combination, הִגָּיוֹן סלה (ix. 17), in which הִגָּיוֹן refers to the playing of stringed instruments (xcii. 4), it may be inferred that סלה is a note referring, not

[1] For the interpretations of διάψαλμα in the Fathers and the old lexicographers, *vid.* Suicer's *Thes. Eccl.* and Augusti's *Christl. Archäologie*, part 2.

to the singing, but to the instrumental accompaniment. If by this, however, we were to understand a heaping up of grave, expressive accords, and of powerful harmonies in general, we should be confounding ancient and modern music. What is meant is a striking in of the orchestra, or a strengthening of the accompanying instruments, or even a transition from *piano* to *forte*.

In our Psalm we meet this Hebrew *forte* three times. In sixteen Psalms (vii., xx., xxi., xliv., xlvii., xlviii., l., liv., lx., lxi., lxxv., lxxxi., lxxxii., lxxxiii., lxxxv., cxliii.) it occurs once; in fifteen Psalms (iv., ix., xxiv., xxxix., xlix., lii., lv., lvii., lix., lxii., lxvii., lxxvi., lxxxiv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii.) twice; in only seven Psalms (iii., xxxii., xlvi., lxvi., lxviii., lxxvii., cxl.; also in Hab. iii.) thrice; and only in one Psalm (lxxxix.) four times. It nowhere stands at the beginning; for ancient music was not yet so independent, that סֶלָה could correspond altogether to the *ritornello*. Nor does it always occur at the end of strophes, so as to be the sign of a regular interlude; but it is found wherever the instruments, suitably with the melody of the Psalm, are meant to play together in a stirring manner, which is frequently the case even in the middle of the strophe. In our Psalm, it stands at the end of the first, second, and fourth strophes. It can easily be understood why it is not found also at the end of the third.

Not a few Psalms are dated from the time when David was persecuted by Saul; but from the time of the rebellion of Absalom only this one and probably the sixty-third. The Psalter, however, contains other hymns which reflect this second period of persecution; there is therefore so much the more reason for admitting as tradition the words of the title: *when he was fleeing from Absalom, his son.* And what is there in the contents of the Psalm to militate against this statement? All the characteristics of the Psalm are in harmony with it: the derision of the psalmist as one who is rejected by God (2 Sam. xvi. 7 *f.*), the danger by night

(2 Sam. xvii. 1), the myriads of people (2 Sam. xv. 13, xvii. 11), the high position of honour held by the singer. Hitzig will rather make the companion Psalms iii. and iv. refer to the raid of the Amalekites during David's settlement in Ziklag. But seeing that at that time Zion-Jerusalem was not yet captured, this conjecture necessitates a misinterpretation of 5 *b*. And the circumstance that the Psalm contains no allusion to Absalom is no objection to the validity of the title. It is explained by the mood of 2 Sam. xix. 1. And if Psalms belonging to the time when he was persecuted by Absalom had to make themselves known by such allusions, we should have to come to the conclusion that there are no such Psalms in the whole collection.

Vers. 2, 3. The first strophe contains the Psalmist's complaint regarding the present distress. In combination with מָה exclamative, רַבּוּ is accented upon the last syllable also in civ. 24; the accentuation of the perfect of verbs ע״ע very frequently (even without *waw* consecutive) follows the analogy of the strong verb (Ges., § 67, remark 12). צַר (√צר, to press, lace; cog. זר, אֵיסַר) denotes the oppressor as well as the oppression, straits, or need (cf. ضرورة, necessity). A direct statement then takes the place of the exclamation, and the רַבִּים implied in the predicate רַבּוּ now becomes the subject of participial predicates: the insurrection continues and is growing. The לְ of לְנַפְשִׁי signifies "in the direction of;" with an address following, as in xi. 1, it = "to"; or, as here and frequently (*e.g.* Gen. xxi. 7), with a narrative following, it = "of," "regarding." The use of לְנַפְשִׁי instead of לִי implies that the words of his adversaries pronounce judgment upon his inmost being, upon his personal relationship to God. יְשׁוּעָתָה is a pathetic form of יְשׁוּעָה, whether it be with a double feminine ending (Ges., Ew., Olsh.), or, what we with Hupfeld hold to be more in accordance with the usage and the analogy of the language (comp. xliv. 27 with lxxx. 3, and לֵילָה, properly

νύκτα, then like the common Greek ἡ νύκτα, νύχθα), with an original accusative *ah* of direction. God is the ground of salvation; no longer to have any salvation in Him is equivalent to being rooted out of the grace of God. Open foes as well as perplexed friends regard him as one who is henceforth rejected. In the beginning of that year, in which, by renewing the war against Ammon and Syria, David reached the summit of external power, he had, by his adultery with Bathsheba, plunged himself into the deepest abyss of wretchedness. The rebellion of Absalom was one of the disastrous fatalities which from that time broke in upon him. There were not wanting apparent justifications of such words as these, which gave up his cause for lost.

Vers. 4, 5. Cleansed by penitence, however, he stands towards God, and God towards him, in a totally different relationship from that which men imagine. Every hour he has reason to fear an attack that will annihilate him; but Jahve is the shield that covers him before and behind (בָּעַד, constr. of בַּעַד = בַּעֲדִ, accusative of a noun which signifies division, partition, and which can therefore be said also of covering, protection, just as in Arabic it is used to denote an interval of time). His kingdom has been taken from him, but Jahve is his glory. With covered and sunk head he went up the Mount of Olives (2 Sam. xv. 30), but Jahve is the lifter up of his head, inasmuch as He comforts and helps him. Gen. xv. 1 (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 29) is the original source of this believing "God is a shield." Far from having to pray without being heard, he is assured of an answer whenever he prays. Here, where אֶקְרָא does not stand in a historical connection, the translation: "I called and He answered me," is wrong; as is evident from lv. 17*f.* (cf. on cxx. 1), the consecutive impf. does not demand this; we have here only a confident expression of the fact, that a reply on God's part follows his prayer. In such collocations of words as קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא, Hitzig and Hupfeld regard קוֹלִי as the

more specific subject in addition to the more general one (as in xliv. 3, lxix. 11, lxxxiii. 19): "my voice—I cried;" but although the position of the words is favourable to such an interpretation in lxix. 11, cviii. 2, it is not so in xvii. 10, xxvii. 7, lvii. 5, lxvi. 17, cxlii. 2, Isa. xxvi. 9, or in the passage before us. According to Ew., § 281 *c*, קוֹלִי is the accusative of more precise definition, as it is undoubtedly in Isa. x. 30 (cf. Ps. lx. 7, xvii. 13*f.*); the crying is thereby represented as being loud.[1] This cry is followed, as is indicated by וַיַּעֲנֵנִי as a pure mood of sequence, by an answer, or, as עָנָה (cf. عَنَّ, to meet, confront, stand over against) originally means, by a reply, and that too from the quarter whither it was directed: מֵהַר קָדְשׁוֹ. David had transferred the ark of the covenant from Kirjath Jearim to Zion. When, fleeing before Absalom, he quitted Jerusalem, he had not taken it with him (2 Sam. xv. 25). He was, therefore, separated by a hostile power from the place of the divine presence; but his prayer penetrates to the cherubic throne, and the answer of Him who is enthroned there knows no partition wall of space or created things.

Vers. 6, 7. God's protection of him during the by-gone night is now a pledge to him in the early morning that this God will still protect him. It is a grammatical blunder to render וְאִישָׁנָה: I shall fall asleep; or, I am falling asleep. The 1st pers. *impf. consec.*, which is characterised by וְ, is

[1] Böttcher also (*Collectanea*, p. 166*f.*) advocates the view that in such passages, נַפְשִׁי, פִּי, קוֹלִי are *oppositum vicarium subjecti*, and therefore *nominatives*. But (1) the circumstance, that אֶת never stands alongside of such expressions, is accounted for by the fact that it does not suit an adverbial secondary qualification. And (2), that the same terms appear elsewhere as direct subjects, as well as (3), that they elsewhere alternate in the parallel member of the sentence with the subject that is implied in the verb (cxxx. 5; Prov. viii. 4)—from these two circumstances no conclusion can be drawn. The syntactical controversy is, moreover, an old one, and is already discussed at considerable length by Kimchi in his Book of Roots, *sub rad.* אוה.

wont to take an *ah* of direction, which strengthens the idea of sequence subjectively: "And so I then fell asleep" (cf. vii. 5, cxix. 55 and frequently). This is especially the case in the later style (cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 24, *q.v.*, Ezra ix. 3; Neh. xiii. 21); *vid.* Böttcher, *Neue Aehrenlese*, No. 412. It is a retrospective glance at the past night. Awakening in health and strength, he feels grateful to Him to whom he owes it: ה׳ יִסְמָכֵנִי. It is the consequence of the fact, that Jahve supports him, that God's hand is his pillow. Because this loving, almighty hand is under his head (Cant. ii. 6), he is unapproachable, and therefore also void of fear. שִׁית (שׁוּת) implies its object in itself: to take up a position, as in Isa. xxii. 7; synon. חָנָה (xxvii. 3) and שִׂים (1 Kings xx. 19); cf. ἐπιτιθέναι τινί (= ἐπικεῖσθαί τινι, which Syro-Hexap., Job xix. 3, translates by ܫܡ ܥܠ). David does not put a merely possible case. Instead of רִבָּבוֹת (König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 71), the Targum has רִיבוֹת. For this, however, there was no reason: the whole of Israel, and therefore tens of thousands, had taken the side of Absalom. Here, at the end of the third strophe, סלה is wanting, because the לֹא אִירָה is not spoken in a tone of triumph, but is only a humble, quiet expression of believing confidence. If the instruments had fallen in here in a bold and defiant manner, a cry for help, wrung from him by the straits that were still surrounding him, could not have followed.

Vers. 8, 9. The daring קוּמָה is taken from the mouth of Moses (Num. x. 35). God arises, when He interposes decisively in that which takes place here below. Instead of *Kûmah* it is accented *Kumáh* as *Mílra*, in order (seeing that the reading קוּמָה אֲדֹנָי is presupposed) to separate the final sound *ah* sharply from the following similar initial sound, and so to render possible a pure, exact utterance of the latter (Hitz., Ew., § 228 *b*).[1] Besides יהוה there stands

[1] This is the reason of the accentuation *schubáh*, *kumáh*, *schithâh* before יהוה; it is intended to prevent the one or the other of the two

also אֱלֹהַי, with the suffix of appropriating faith. The cry for help then justifies itself with כִּי and a retrospective perfect. The perfects here are not such perfects of prophetically assured hope as in vi. 9, vii. 7, ix. 5 *f.*; for in our passage the logical connection demands an appeal to what has already been experienced: they express facts of experience, which have been gathered from many individual occurrences (hence כל) that have taken place up to the time when he is praying. The verb הִכָּה is construed with a double accusative; cf. Il., 16, 597: *τὸν μὲν ἄρα Γλαῦκος στῆθος μέσον οὖτασε δουρί.* Smiting upon the cheek is the grossest insult (Job xvi. 20; Mic. iv. 14 and freq.); taken along with the breaking (שִׁבַּר) of the teeth, it is at the same time the rendering of those harmless who are so treated.[1] According to *Berachoth* 56 *b* the falling away of both cheeks,

gutturals from being slurred over in the rapid speaking (שלא יבולעו). For the same reason this takes place even in cases where, not the divine name, but another word beginning with an א or a similar letter, and closely connected by meaning and accentuation, follows; *e.g.* in Judg. iv. 18, סוּרָא is twice *Milra* before א; in lvii. 9, עוּרָה is *Milra* before ה; לָמָּה is *Milra* before ה in Ex. v. 22; נָחָה in Isa. xi. 2 and הֲבָאתָ in Gen. xxvi. 10 are *Milra* before ע. That this is the true explanation appears also from the circumstance, that for a similar reason *Pasek* is placed where two י would coalesce; *e.g.* in Gen. xxii. 14, *Adonaj jir'eh*, with the dividing stroke between the two words; cf. Ex. xv. 18; Prov. viii. 21. The reason why וְשָׁבָה remains *Milel* in Jer. xl. 5 is because it is separated by *Pazer* from the following אֶל-גְּדַלְיָה. שָׁבָה, *Milel* before הָעִיר (2 Sam. xv. 27), is a real exception (*Michlol*, 112 *b*), not, as Norzi mistakenly remarks, a questionable one (*vid.* Masora to Num. x. 36, and *Michlol*, 112 *a*); but it is by no means sufficient to invalidate the purely orthophonetic (not rhythmical) reason assigned for this accentuation upon the last syllable. Even ר has occasionally the same consequence for the accentuation of the words: *rîbâh rîbi* (xliii. 1, cxix. 154). As to the reason of this, *vid. Physiologie und Musik in ihrer Bed. für die Grammatik*, p. 13.

[1] The LXX. translates: *ἐπάταξας πάντας τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντάς μου ματαίως.* It has therefore read לחנם (cf. Ezek. vi. 10) instead of לחי; and accordingly Kaulen (*Einleitung*, 1881, § 308) looks upon לחים (to be punctuated לֶחָיִם) as original.

as seen in a dream, points to the undoing of the device which the mouth of one's enemies has formed. Without any apparent reason שִׁבַּרְתָּ remains here unlengthened (cf. on the other hand Jer. xxviii. 13). What David means is this: the punishment of an ignominious annihilation has always overtaken those who rose up against him and in general against God's appointment. His enemies are conceived of as mordacious monsters, and hence the representation given by him of their final destiny. Jahve has the power and the will to protect His Anointed One from their fury: לַה׳ הַיְשׁוּעָה, *penes Jovam est salus.* יְשׁוּעָה (from יָשַׁע, יָשַׁע, *amplum esse*) signifies breadth, amplitude in the sense of freedom and agreeableness of movement, deliverance and exemption from straits and oppression, prosperity without danger and alloy. In the לְ of appurtenance there are implied the ideas of exclusiveness as regards possession and of freedom as regards disposal. הַיְשׁוּעָה, salvation in all its fulness, stands at the free disposal of Jahve (similarly in Jonah ii. 10; Apoc. vii. 10). By salvation David thinks primarily of his own need of deliverance. But as a genuine king he cannot in God's presence think of himself, without connecting himself in thought also with his people. He accordingly concludes with the intercessory corollary: עַל־עַמְּךָ בִרְכָתֶךָ. We must supply either תְּהִי or תָּבֹא. His imprecations are not directed against his people, but only against those who have seduced them, and their wicked partisans. As in olden times, he still bears his people upon a loving, interceding heart. He commiserates those who have been led astray, without being angry with them. Distinctions vanish altogether from his mind, when he prays for the nation as a whole. The one concluding expression of the Psalm—remarks Ewald—throws a bright light into the depths of his noble soul.

PSALM IV.

THE EVENING HYMN OF ONE WHO IS UNDISMAYED THOUGH FACE TO FACE WITH RAILERS AND MEN OF LITTLE FAITH.

2 When I call, answer me, O God of my righteousness,
Thou who in straits hast set me at large;
Be gracious unto me, and hear my prayer!

3 Ye sons of men, how long shall my glory be turned into dishonour,
Inasmuch as ye love vanity, and seek after falsehood? (*Selah*).
4 Know then that Jahve hath set apart one that is godly for Himself,
Jahve heareth, when I call unto Him.

5 Be ye angry, yet sin not!—
Bethink yourselves in your heart upon your beds, and be still! (*Selah*)
6 Offer sacrifices of righteousness
And attach yourselves to Jahve!

7 Many are saying: "How could we experience any good?"
O lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us, Jahve!
8 Thou hast put joy into my heart,
More than at the time when their corn and new wine abound.

9 In peace will I lay me down and forthwith sleep,
For Thou, O Jahve, in seclusion
Makest me to dwell securely.

The Davidic morning hymn is now followed by a Davidic evening hymn. From the reciprocal relation in which iv. 7 stands to iii. 3, and iii. 6 to iv. 9, it is evident that they belong together. They are the only two Psalms in which the actual words of others are taken up into the prayer with a רבים אמרים. So far as regards the circumstances of the time in which they were written, the one is explained by the title of the other. From the *quousque* of iv. 3 and the words of those of little faith in iv. 7, it follows that Ps. iv. is the later of the two.

It is at the head of this Psalm that we first meet לַמְנַצֵּחַ,[1] an expression which still demands investigation. It occurs fifty-five times in the Psalter: nineteen times in Book I., twenty-five times in Book II., eight times in Book III., and three times in Book V. Only two of the Psalms at the head of which it is found are anonymous, viz. lxvi. and lxvii. All the others bear the names of David or of the singers who were renowned from his time onwards: Thirty-nine are ascribed to David, nine to the Korahites, and five to Asaph. No fewer than thirty of these are Elohistic. It is always the first word of the title; only in the case of Ps. lxxxviii., which might easily be overlooked in the counting, is it otherwise; and that, because there two different titles are combined.

The meaning of the verb נִצַּח (from נָצַח, *clarescere*, Arab., to be pure, clean) is evident from the Chronicles and from the Book of Ezra, which forms a part of them. The predilection of the Chronicler for the history of ritual and for expressions that belonged to an earlier stage of the language has made it easier for us to understand this word also. He uses it when narrating the history of the time of David, of Solomon, of Josiah, of Zerubbabel and Joshua, and always in connection with statements referring to the service and the building of the temple. In 1 Chron. xxiii. 4 (cf. *vv.* 28–32) to look after the service of the temple in an official capacity is called נִצַּח עַל־מְלֶאכֶת בֵּית־ה׳; and in Ezra iii. 8 *f.* the oversight of the work and the workmen, when the temple was building, is described in the same way. The 3,300 (3,600) overseers, who are called הָרֹדִים בָּעָם הָעֹשִׂים בַּמְּלָאכָה in 1 Kings v. 30, are designated by the Chronicler (2 Chron. ii. 1) as מְנַצְּחִים עֲלֵיהֶם. When the temple was being repaired in the time of Josiah, we read that Levites were appointed לְנַצֵּחַ (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12), viz. לְכֹל עֹשֵׂה מְלָאכָה (*v.* 13), instead

[1] With *Gaja*, as is always the case. The rule, with its exceptions, in accordance with which *Gaja* (*Metheg*) stands here, is discussed by Baer in Merx' *Archiv*, 1867, pp. 195 *f.*

of which לְהַעֲבִיד, to keep the people at their work, is said in ii. 17. The primary meaning of נָצַח is, to glance, sparkle, and, indeed, to shine or sparkle in the clearest and brightest manner; this meaning then passes over into the signification, to outshine, and that too both in the sense of unbroken continuance and of pre-eminent ability and victorious superiority (*vid. Ithpa.* Dan. vi. 4, and cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 4 with ix. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 54 with Isa. xxv. 8). מְנַצֵּחַ is therefore one who shows marked ability in any profession, and thence acquires the general signification of master, director, chief overseer.[1] At the head of the Psalms it is usually understood as a designation of the conductor of the temple-music. מְנַצֵּחַ *est dux cantus*—Luther says on one occasion—*quem nos dicimus den Kapellenmeister* [the choir-master], *qui orditur et gubernat cantum*, ἔξαρχος (*Opp. lat.*, xviii. 134, *ed. Erl.*). But (1) even Psalms of Asaph have this למנצח at their head. Now he himself was a conductor of the temple-music, and indeed the chief (הָרֹאשׁ, 1 Chron. xvi. 5); at any rate he was one of the three conductors of the temple-music (Heman, Asaph, Ethan), to whom the twenty-four classes of the 4,000 Levitical singers in the Davidico-Salomonic sanctuary were subordinated. *Vid.* also the title of Ps. xxxix., למנצח לידיתון, according to which the musician Jedithun (Jeduthun) was meant to be the מנצח of this Psalm (*vid.* on Ps. xxxix.). (2) The principal passage of the Chronicler (1 Chron. xv. 17–21) which falls to be considered in this connection does not at all harmonize with this view. According to this passage the three conductors of the temple-music had cymbals לְהַשְׁמִיעַ,

[1] Not, however, of "victor," the meaning in accordance with which Aquila renders τῷ νικοποιῷ, Symm. ἐπινίκιος, Theod. εἰς τὸ νῖκος; for what Chrysostom says with reference to the εἰς τέλος of the LXX. in Job xxiii. 3: παρ' Ἑβραίοις τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ νίκη διὰ μιᾶς σημαίνεται λέξεως applies to totally different periods of the language; נֶצַח, victory, מְנַצֵּחַ, victor, are Hebræo-Aramaic. Cf. the progress of the verbs זָכָה, to strike the eyes, and ظهر, to light up brightly, to this same meaning of triumphing (Fleischer in Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, i. 424.

to sound aloud, eight other musicians of high rank had psalteries, and six others had harps לְנַצֵּחַ. This cannot signify "in order to conduct," for that was undoubtedly the function of the first-mentioned three, and the cymbals were also better suited for that purpose than the harps. It signifies "in order to lead the orchestra": the cymbals conducted, and the harps, better adapted for leading the instruments, bore some such relation to the former as the violins now bear to the clarionettes. Accordingly מְנַצֵּחַ is not the conductor of the temple-music, but musician in general; and למנצח directs the Psalm to him whose duty it is to arrange it, and to train the Levitical choirs; it indicates therefore that the Psalm is to be received into the number of the temple songs that are to be accompanied with instrumental music. The translation of the Targum (Luth.): לְשַׁבָּחָא, "to be sung liturgically," corresponds with this general meaning; so also does that of the LXX.: *εἰς τὸ τέλος*, if this signifies "to be performed," and does not rather ascribe to the Psalm an eschatological meaning.[1]

The appended בִּנְגִינוֹת is not dependent upon למנצח. We see this from Hab. iii. 19: for the musician, with an accompaniment on my stringed instruments (*vid.* my Commentary), where Hitzig translates: for the chief singer of my musical pieces; but נִצַּח בְּ is a phrase of which there is no evidence, and נְגִינָה is not the name for a piece of music. The *Piel* נִגֵּן, complete with בְּיָד, signifies "to pluck the strings" (cog. נָגַע), to play upon a stringed instrument. From this come

[1] So, *e.g.* Eusebius: *εἰς τὸ τέλος ὡς ἂν μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μελλόντων πληροῦσθαι*, and Theodoret: *σημαίνει τὸ εἰς τὸ τέλος ὅτι μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις πληρωθήσεται τὰ προφητευόμενα*, with which *Pesachim*, 117 *a*, agrees: ניצוח וניגון לעתיד לבא, *i.e.* Psalms with למנצח and בנגינות refer to the last days. Gregory of Nyssa combines the different translations when he gives the interpretation: *εἰς τέλος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη*. Ewald's view, that *τέλος* in this formula signifies consecration, celebration, worship, is improbable; the word does not occur in this sense in the Septuagint.

נְגִינוֹת (lxxvii. 7; Isa. xxxviii. 20), which is almost used as a *pluralet.*: the playing on a stringed instrument, and בִּנְגִינוֹת, which occurs in the titles of Pss. iv., vi., liv., lv., lxvii., lxxvi.: with an accompaniment of stringed instruments (בְּ as in xlix. 5; Isa. xxx. 29, 32). The hymn is to be sung to the accompaniment, probably to the sole accompaniment, of stringed instruments. That the words למנצח בנגינות stand in the superscription before מזמור לדוד is probably owing to the circumstance that they were originally written above the chief title, which gave the generic name of the hymn as well as its author.

Ver. 2. Jahve is אֱלֹהֵי צִדְקִי, the possessor of righteousness, the author of righteousness, the vindicator of righteousness that is misjudged and persecuted. David believingly calls this God of righteousness his (cf. xxiv. 5; lix. 11); for the righteousness, that he has, he has in Him, and the righteousness, that he looks for, he looks for from Him. His past experience assures him that he does not look in vain: Thou who hast made amplitude (room) for me when in straits. Seeing that בַּצָּר הִרְחַבְתָּ לִי thus assigns the ground of his confidence, it is more probable that we have before us an attributive clause (Hitz.) rather than an independent one; at any rate it is retrospective. הרחבת is not precative (Böttch.); for the precative perfect of certainty, if such a perfect is to be assumed (*vid.* Driver, "Hebrew Tenses," § 20), is confined to such exclamatory utterances as Job xxi. 16 (*vid.* notes on that passage). He grounds his prayer upon two facts: upon his fellowship with God, the righteous One, and upon the justifying grace he has already experienced from Him. Already he has been many a time in straits, and God has set him at large. The combination רח is intended to express the idea of the expansion of the breathing (of the current of air) and of space (*D. M. Z.*, xii. 657).[1] Here also

[1] That the primary meaning of רחם is probably not that of softness, tenderness, but that of amplitude, *vid.* notes on xviii. 2.

what is meant is the enlargement of his oppressed heart (xxv. 17; Isa. lx. 5), and the enlargement of his straitened circumstances (xviii. 20, cxviii. 5). On the *Daghesh* in לִי *vid.* notes on lxxxiv. 4. חָנֵּנִי is a denominative from חֵן, grace: be gracious unto me; for it is always combined only with the accusative; חֵן, however, goes back upon חָנַן = حَنَّ, cf. حنا, to incline to, to bend oneself.[1]

Vers. 3, 4. Righteous in the sight of God he turns to rebuke those who disparage him, whose honour is the glory of God, viz. the partisans of Absalom. As distinguished from בְּנֵי־אָדָם, men who are lost in the multitude, בְּנֵי־אִישׁ signifies men who are prominent among their fellows (for this distinction cf. such passages as xlix. 3, lxii. 10; Prov. viii. 4; Isa. ii. 9, v. 15). In this and the previous Psalm David no more speaks of his degenerate son, than of the infatuated king in the Psalms that belong to the time when he was persecuted by Saul. His words are addressed to the aristocratic party, whose tool Absalom had become. He cries to them: till when (עַד־מָה; מָה, though followed by a non-guttural, having ָ without any apparent reason; cf. x. 13; Isa. i. 5; Jer. xvi. 10), *i.e.* how long shall my glory be turned to shame, viz. in your sight and by means of you; just as one can also say in Latin, *quousque tandem dignitas mea ludibrio?* As to כְּלִמָּה (נִכְלַם) *vid.* on xxxv. 4. The two following members are circumstantial clauses subordinated to the principal clause with עַד־מָה (in the same way as in Isa. i. 5 *a*; Ew., § 341 *b*); the energetic imperfect with *nun paragogic* not being wont to stand at the head of independent clauses. We must therefore translate: "inasmuch as ye love רִיק, vanity"—the proper name for their exaltation is hollow appearance—"inasmuch as ye go in quest of כָּזָב, falsehood"[2]—they seek to scrape together as

[1] *Vid.* the article on the Mosaic priestly blessing in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1882, p. 123.

[2] In the perf., imperf., and partic. the קְ of the verb בָּקַשׁ loses its

many lying pretexts as possible, in order that they may drag the honour of the legitimate king into the mire. The assertion that what is meant by כְּבוֹדִי is David's personal honour, and not his royal dignity, divides what is indivisible. They burn with the desire to deprive him at once of his personal and his official honour. Accordingly David, in opposition to them, appeals (*v.* 4) not only to the divine election, but also to his personal relation to God, upon which the former is grounded. As in 2 Kings iv. 41 the ו of וְדַעוּ is the *waw* of sequence: so know then. The *Hiph.* הִפְלָה (from פָּלָא = פָּלָה, cog. פָּלַל, literally, to divide) signifies to make a separation or distinction (Ex. ix. 4, xi. 7), then to distinguish (Ex. viii. 18) and to show (Ps. xvii. 7; cf. xxxi. 22) in an extraordinary and marvellous manner; so that what is meant is not his mere selection (בָּחַר), but his having been marvellously selected for a remarkable position of honour (LXX., Vulg., *mirificavit; Windberger Psalmübers., gewunderlichet*). As in cxxxv. 4 לוֹ belongs to the verb, and the principal accent lies upon חָסִיד: he whom Jahve Himself, and not men, has so marvellously distinguished is a חָסִיד, a godly man. חָסִיד is not passive in meaning (Hupf.), so that, like κεχαριτωμένος, it would signify "the one to whom grace is shown," "the beloved"; for God Himself is called חָסִיד (cxlv. 17; cf. Jer. iii. 12), and according to xii. 2 (cf. Isa. lvii. 1) חָסִיד is equivalent to אִישׁ חֶסֶד. It is accordingly not the one who experiences חסד (he to whom grace or favour is shown, the beloved) that is so called; but he who shows חסד (Prov. xi. 17), *i.e.* who in accordance with God's will makes his fellow-men and God Himself (cf. Jon. ii. 9 with Ps. cxliv. 2) the objects of His love. It is a word of the same form as פָּלִיט, פָּרִיץ and the like. It is derived from חָסַד, √חס, حس, *stringere*, to strike, literally to feel oneself struck, *i.e.* strongly affected (cf. *hiss*, a sense-impression), said in Hebrew of a *Daghesh*, and retains it only in the imperative (בְּקֹשׁוּ, יְבַקְּשׁוּ, מְבַקְּשִׁים, but בַּקְּשׁוּ.

strong, ardent feeling of love. As one who is a חסיד and therefore far from being a reprobate he does not call upon God in vain, but finds a ready hearing. Their undertaking is accordingly contrary to the will of God as thus marvellously made known, and must come to nought in consequence of the loving relationship in which the dethroned and dishonoured one stands to God.

Vers. 5, 6. The address to the rebels is continued: they are to reflect upon their ways and adhere to Jahve, instead of allowing themselves to be carried away by arrogance and discontent. The LXX. has already rendered this exhortation correctly: ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε (cf. Eph. iv. 26), if ye will be angry, beware of sinning, viz. detraction and rebellion (cf. the similar paratactic combinations in xxviii. 1; Josh. vi. 18; Isa. xii. 1). In the rendering *contremiscite* one misses any expression of that before which they are to tremble (viz. the sure punishment of God). He warns his adversaries against blind passion and, in order that they may not subvert their own salvation, counsels them to betake themselves to quiet meditation and solitary reflection. To speak in one's own heart is, when no object is attached, equivalent to bethinking one's self (cf. Cato in *Gell.*, xvi. 1, *cogitate cum animis vestris*), and the couch or place of rest, not to understand it literally, points to a condition of the mind in which it is open to quiet contemplation. The heart is the seat of the conscience; and the Spirit of God (as Haman, *Werke*, i. 98, remarks) disguises itself in our own voice, so that we see His exhortation, His counsel, and His wisdom welling forth from our own stony hearts. The second imperative carries out the thought of the first: and desist, literally, be silent (דֳּמִם ✓דם, to press flat, to smoothen, to appease; to be steady, to be still or quiet), *i.e.* having come to yourselves in consequence of self-examination, put an end to your fury—an authoritative monition uttered in the self-consciousness of innocence, and to which

the music, which strikes in here, has to give emphasis. In *v.* 6 the admonition passes over into exhortation It is self-evident that, while David and his faithful followers were fugitives from Jerusalem, the sacrificial worship in the sanctuary had still continued. With reference to this he calls upon the followers of Absalom: offer זִבְחֵי־צֶדֶק. Here at least these are not sacrifices which, instead of consisting in slaughtered animals, consist in actions which are in accordance with God's will; they are sacrifices that are offered in the right disposition, in the disposition that is in conformity with the mind of God, and not in the hypocritical spirit with which they consecrate their evil cause and think to insinuate themselves into the divine favour. In li. 21 and Deut. xxxiii. 19 also the "sacrifices of righteousness" are real sacrifices—the expression is not merely a symbolical designation of ethical performances. Not less significant is the exhortation, וּבִטְחוּ אֶל־יְהוָה. As in xxxi. 7, lvi. 4, lxxxvi. 2 the verb בָּטַח is construed with אֶל, inasmuch as with the idea of trusting there is combined that of bending towards, adhering to, attaching one's self to. The Arabic بَطَحَ, to be hollow, widened out, has preserved the original physical meaning of the word; it is a physical term, which, when used psychologically (cf. רָחַב, Isa. lx. 5, and بَسَطَ), denotes the effect which is produced by a bright cheerful mood upon the heart, the brow, the countenance and the whole being of man; it then denotes this mood itself, and so comes to have the meaning: to be free from anxiety, of good cheer, confident. They should renounce that confidence in themselves which beguiles them into opposition to the king who is deprived of all human assistance. If they would but surrender themselves trustfully to God, the grumbling and angry dissatisfaction, from which the rebellion had sprung, would also be appeased. Thus far the address to the rebel magnates.

Vers. 7, 8. Casting a glance into his own small camp, David becomes aware of a dispiritedness that is gradually

growing. The words: who will make us see, *i.e.* (as in xxxiv. 13) experience, any good? may, after the analogy of 2 Sam. xiii. 15, Isa. xlii. 23, be taken as a wish; but the situation gives them the stamp rather of a dubious question suggested by a hopeless glance into the future. The darkness has already continued so long for David's companions in sorrow, that their faith is turning into fear, their hope into despair. He accordingly implores with reference to them: O lift up upon us (נְסֵה־עָלֵינוּ)[1] the light of Thy countenance. The form of the petition reminds us of the priestly blessings in Num. vi. 24 *ff.* There it is said in the second sentence: יָאֵר ה׳ פָּנָיו, in the third: יִשָּׂא ה׳ פָּנָיו · and here these two wishes are fused into one prayer. Instead of נְיִשָּׂא (x. 12), we are surprised to find the verb written נְסֵה, which looks as if, with an allusion to נֵס, it were intended to mean, to lift up after the manner of a banner or flag (Symm. *ἐπίσημον ποίησον*); but if from נָסַס, نَصَّ, to lift up and thereby render perceptible and visible from afar, the imperative must have been pronounced differently. What was intended, therefore, was undoubtedly נְשֵׂא, lift up; the reading נְסֵה may be owing to a confusion with נֵס and its root. In the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures there is no other such echo of the second and third sentences of the Aaronic blessing; more especially the ישׂא ה׳ פניו אליך has no other such parallel as here in this Psalm of David. In his mouth it is a petition of assured faith; for notwithstanding the hopelessness of the outlook at present, he is even now already at peace in his God. The joy which, in the midst of the affliction caused

[1] In the three metrical books the *Metheg* that stands in the second syllable before the tone, in cases where this syllable is the first of a word that is marked with a great disjunctive without a preceding conjunctive and begins with *Schebâ*, is placed alongside of this *Schebâ*; thus, not נְסֵה־עָלֵינוּ, but נְסֵה־עָלֵינוּ. Cf. li. 2, בְּבוֹא־; lxix. 28, תְּנָה־; lxxxi. 3, שְׂאוּ־; cxvi. 17, לְךָ־; cxix. 175, תְּחִי־. As in וְהָיָה, i. 3, the intonation is to commence with the *ĕ*. *Vid.* on xci. 15.

by outward want, Jahve has put into his heart, is מִעֵת דְּגָנָם וְתִירוֹשָׁם רָבּוּ. The expression is as concise as possible. (1) *Gaudium præ* is equivalent to *gaudium magnum præ = majus quam;* (2) מֵעֵת, after the analogy of the *comparatio decurtata* (*e.g.* xviii. 34, my feet like the hinds, *i.e.* like the feet of the hinds), is equivalent to מִשִּׁמְחַת עֵת; (3) the most natural way of expressing what is meant: מעת (אשר) רבו דגנם ותירושם, is avoided, in order that רבו may be placed with emphasis at the end of the clause, and consequently, though the meaning remains the same, the several members of the clause stand in a different relation to one another. It may therefore be rendered: "more (greater) than in the time of their corn and their new wine, of which there is much," so that רבו, separated from its subjects, by itself alone represents the attributive clause (= אשר רבו); or even (what Wickes, comparing Prov. viii. 25 *a*, prefers): "more than (for מן is certainly meant comparatively, and not temporally) in the time of their corn and their new wine, theirs is great." The more natural way of expressing this was מעת רבו; the poet, however, preferred to place רבו, as being the word with the principal accent, emphatically at the end. As regards the accentuation, it is to be noted that *Tarcha Munach* are transformed, according to *Accentsystem*, xviii. 2, out of *Mercha Mugrasch*, (דגנם ותירושם). The neuter plurals, corn and new wine, seeing that both these stores are brought specially into prominence, are united with the plural instead of the singular of the predicate. The suffixes do not refer, as in lxv. 10, to the inhabitants of the land in general, but to the followers of Absalom, the portion of the nation that had rebelled. When David came to Mahanaim, while the rebels were encamped in Gilead, the country round about was hostile to him, so that he had to receive the means of subsistence as a kind of clandestine support (2 Sam. xvii. 26–29). It was probably about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles. The grain harvest and the vintage were over. A rich harvest of

corn and new wine had been gathered in. In these rich stores, which were at their disposal, the rebel troops of Absalom had a reserve of the greatest importance. David and his host had the appearance of a band of beggars or free-booters. But the king who has been brought down from the sceptre to the beggar's staff is nevertheless more satisfied than they, the rebels. What he has in his heart is a better treasure than what they have in their barns and cellars.

Ver. 9. So he lays himself down to sleep serenely and peacefully. The hymn closes here with a strophe of three lines, just as it had commenced. The word with the principal accent is בְּשָׁלוֹם, which Wickes found appropriately punctuated with *Rebîa* in two codices. יַחְדָּו (lit. in its associations, = collectively, Olsh., § 135 *c*, like כֻּלּוֹ, altogether) is by no means without emphasis; nor is it so in xix. 10, where it signifies "all together, without exception." When used along with synonymous verbs, it denotes the juxtaposition of that which they mention, as in Isa. xlii. 14. So also in cxli. 10, where it indicates that the overthrow of the enemies and the deliverance of him that is persecuted occur at one and the same time. So here: he will retire to rest and will even forthwith fall asleep (וְאִישָׁן, in a continuous cohortative sense, = וְאִישְׁנָה). His God makes him to dwell free of care though in seclusion. לְבָדָד is a first and לָבֶטַח a second adverbial qualification The former is not (after the analogy of Deut. xxxii. 12) equivalent to לְבַדּוֹ, an adjunct which would stand here without any conceivable antithesis, and would therefore be meaningless. We must therefore understand it after the analogy of Num. xxiii. 9, Mic. vii. 14, Deut. xxxiii. 28, and Jer. xlix. 31; and this the situation also demands. He requires no guards; for he is hedged round about by Jahve, and kept in peace by Him. The seclusion, בָּדָד, in which he finds himself, is security, בֶּטַח, because Jahve is with him. In how many ways and how sweetly is the nature of faith expressed in this and the pre

ceding Psalm: he finds his righteousness, his excellency, his joy, his peace, his satisfaction in God! And how finely conceived is the rhythm! In the last line the evening hymn itself sinks to rest. The iambics with which it concludes are like the last notes of a cradle-song, which die away softly and as if falling into slumber themselves. In his *Convito* Dante has justly observed, that the sweetness of the music and harmony of the Hebrew Psalter is lost in the Greek and Latin translations.

PSALM V.

MORNING PRAYER BEFORE GOING INTO THE HOUSE OF GOD.

2 Give ear unto my words, O Jahve,
Attend unto my meditation!
3 Listen to my loud cry, my King and my God,
For unto Thee is my supplication addressed.
4 Jahve, in the morning shalt Thou hear my cry,
In the morning I order my sacrifice for Thee and look out.

5 For Thou art not a God to whom wickedness is a delight,
The evil man cannot sojourn with Thee.
6 Boasters do not maintain their ground before Thine eyes,
Thou hatest all the workers of iniquity.
7 Thou destroyest them that speak lies,
The man of blood-guiltiness and of deceit Jahve abhorreth.

8 Yet I, through Thy rich grace, may enter Thy house,
May worship towards Thy holy royal seat in Thy fear.
9 Jahve, lead me by Thy righteousness because of them that lie in wait for me.
Make Thy way level before me—
10 For in his mouth is nothing steadfast, their inward part is destruction,
An open grave is their throat, with a tongue made smooth.

11 Let them pay the penalty, Elohim; let them fall away from their counsels;
In the multitude of their transgressions thrust them out, that bid Thee defiance;

12 So that all that trust in Thee may be glad, may ever shout for joy;
And protect them, so that they may triumph in Thee, that love Thy name.
13 For Thou, even Thou, dost bless the righteous man—
Jahve! with favour, as with a shield, surroundest Thou him.

The evening prayer is now followed by a second morning prayer, which like the former draws to its close with כִּי־אַתָּה (iv. 9, v. 13). The situation is different from that in Ps. iii. There David is a fugitive; here he is in Jerusalem and thinks of visiting the temple in order to take part in its worship. If this Psalm also belongs to the time of Absalom's rebellion, it must have been composed while the fire, which broke out later, was already glowing in secret.

The אֶל־הַנְּחִילוֹת of the title is by no means a motto indicating the purport of the Psalm (the view of Jerome, following LXX., Aq., Symm.; Luther, following Jer., translates it: *for the inheritance*). If such were the case, it would stand after מִזְמוֹר. Whatever goes along with למנצח has always a musical signification. If, after the analogy of the Talmudic נְחִיל, נְחִילוֹת denotes swarms, and indeed swarms of bees (نَحْل), then הנחילות must be the beginning of a popular song, to the melody of which the Psalm was adapted; Haja Gaon, however, understands a melody that resembles the humming of bees; Reggio, a song that sings of bees. Dyserinck, in his Dutch Psalter (Haarlem, 1871), renders it: *met fluiten;* and it is better to take נְחִילוֹת with him as being equivalent to נְחִלוֹת (from חָלַל, חלّ, to pierce), and therefore a special name for the flutes (חֲלִילִים), perhaps for the double flute, *i.e.* two flutes with a common mouthpiece. The use of the flute in divine worship is attested by Isa. xxx. 29 (cf. 1 Sam. x. 5; 1 Kings i. 40).[1] The prep. אֶל was more suitable than עַל,

[1] Regarding the use of the flute in the second Temple, *vid.* Introduction, p. 42.

because the singer cannot at the same time play the flute, but can only sing to the accompaniment of the flute-playing of another (Redslob).

The Psalm consists of four strophes of six lines each. Here and there the lines of the strophes approximate to the scheme of the cæsura. They consist of a rising and an abrupt falling of the rhythm. Our language, which requires far more words in order to express the thought, is not well adapted to this cæsural scheme.

Vers. 2–4. Introit: a petition that he may be heard. The thoughts are simple, but the language is select. אֲמָרִים is the plur. of אֹמֶר (אָמַר), a word that is peculiar to the poetico-prophetical style. The denominative הֶאֱזִין (like *audire*, from *aus*, *οὖς*) is also more at home in poetry than in prose. הָגִיג (like אָבִיב) or הֲגִיג (like מְהִיר) occurs only in two Psalms לדוד: here and in xxxix. 4. Derived from הָגַג (whence the Syriac *hagogutho*, imagination, fancy) = הָגָה (*vid.* i. 2), it signifies that which is spoken meditatively; here, praying in deep devotion. Thus beginning, the prayer gradually grows in intensity so as to become a *vox clamoris*. שַׁוְעִי, from שָׁוַע, to be distinguished from שַׁוְעִי (*inf. Pi.*) in xxviii. 2, xxxi. 23, is the same word as the Aram. צָוַח and the Ethiop. ṣawĕa (to cry, to call), if it does not rather go along with יָשַׁע and is related to it as استغاث, *opem implorare*, to غاث, *opitulari*. On הַקְשִׁיב, said of intent listening, *vid.* x. 17. The invocation, מַלְכִּי וֵאלֹהָי, is so much the more significant, if the suppliant is a king. David and the theocratic king in general only represent the invisible One, whom he along with the whole of Israel worships as his King. Prayer to Him is his first daily task. In the morning, בֹּקֶר (as in lv. 18, cf. بُكْرَةً, in the morning, this morning, instead of בַּבֹּקֶר, lxxxviii. 14), Thou shalt hear my cry, *i.e.* my cry that is addressed to Thee early in the morning. In the mention of the morning Hupfeld finds only a "poetical element," and thereby obliterates

not only the *prima luce*, but also the beautiful and natural reference to the daily morning sacrifice. The verb עָרַךְ is the word commonly used for piling up and putting in order the sacrificial wood (Lev. i. 7) and the pieces of the sacrifices (Lev. i. 8, 12, vi. 5), for setting up the sacred lamp (Ex. xxvii. 21; Lev. xxiv. 3*f.*), and for setting the shew-bread in order (Ex. xl. 23; Lev. xxiv. 8). The putting in order of the wood for the morning sacrificial lamb was one of the first priestly functions, as soon as day began to dawn (Lev. vi. 5, cf. Num. xxviii. 4); the lamb was slain before sunrise, and, as soon as the sun had risen above the horizon, was brought by pieces and laid upon the altar. Morning prayer is compared to this morning sacrifice. It also is in its way a sacrifice. The object, which David has in his mind when he uses אֶעֱרֹךְ, is תְּפִלָּתִי. Just as, early in the morning, the priests lay the wood and the pieces of the sacrifice of the *Tamîd* upon the altar, so he brings his prayer before God as a spiritual sacrifice, and looks out for an answer (צָפָה, *speculari*, as in Hab. ii. 1, cf. on x. 8), in much the same way as the priest would look out for fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice, or for the smoke, to see that it rose straight up towards heaven.

Vers. 5–7. The grounding of his petition upon God's holiness. In order to obviate the danger of reading לֹא אֵל together (a not-God, after the analogy of Deut. xxxii. 21), אֵל־חָפֵץ is bound together by means of *Makkef* (*vid.* Wickes, *Accentuation*, p. 85, note 8). The verbal adj. חָפֵץ (starting from the primary meaning, to adhere immoveably, a meaning that is still preserved in خفض *fut. i*) is in the *sing.* always joined with the accusative (xxxiv. 13, xxxv. 27). רָע is meant personally, for although גּוּר may have a material object, it cannot have a material subject. Instead of יָגוּר עִמְּךָ, it is said more briefly (Ges., § 121, 4) יְגֻרְךָ. The verb גּ ר (to turn in, to take up one's abode with or beside any one) has frequently (like יָשַׁב, lxxx. 2; Zech. ii. 11) an accusative object (*e.g.* Judg. v. 17), even in cases where that object is personal, as

here and cxx. 5; cf. Isa. xxxiii. 14, according to which passage the light of the divine holiness is for sinners a consuming fire, which they cannot endure. There now follow specialising designations of the wicked. The הוֹלְלִים, *part. Kal* = *hōlᵉlîm*, or even *Poal* = *hôlᵉlîm* (= מְהוֹלְלִים),[1] are the fools, and more especially the foolish boasters. The primary meaning of the verb is not that of being hollow, but that of sounding, then of loud, obstreperous, irrational behaviour. Of such it is said that they cannot maintain their ground, when they become manifest to the sight of God (לְנֶגֶד, as in ci. 7, manifest before any one, from נָגַד, to step forward, to be visible from afar, to be distinctly visible). The פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן are such as practice (οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι, Matt. vii. 23) vileness. אָוֶן, breath (ἄνεμος), is partly trouble, causing one to pant, partly wickedness, in which there is not even a trace of nobler, true ethical contents. These Jahve hates; for if He did not hate evil (xi. 5), His love would not be holy. In דִּבְּרֵי כָזָב, דִּבְּרֵי is the usual copulative form in the plural, instead of מְדַבְּרֵי. Similarly in lviii. 4. In other respects also the form of expression is Davidic: אִישׁ דָּמִים וּמִרְמָה (as in lv. 24), and אֲבַד (as in ix. 6, cf. xxi. 11). תְּעַב (in Amos vi. 8, תִּאֵב) seems to be a secondary formation from עוּב, like תָּאַב, to desire, covet, from אָבָה; it is therefore from the same root as the Aram. עִיב, to despise, contemn, revile, and the Arab. *ʿaib*, a blemish (cf. on Lam. ii. 1). The circumstance that, as Hengstenberg observes, wickedness and wicked men are described in a sevenfold way, is probably merely accidental.

Vers. 8–10. The Psalm being a morning hymn, the *impff.*

[1] As to the rule, in accordance with which, here as well as in שְׁוֹרְרָי, *v.* 9, and the like, the simple *Schebâ mobile* passes over into *Chatef pathach* with a preceding *Gaja*, vid. *Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1863, p. 411. In such cases as well as in others, the Babylonian Ben-Naftali (about 940) prefers simple *Schebâ*, while the Tiberian Ben-Ascher, whom the *Textus receptus* follows with comparatively few exceptions, prefers the *Chatef*. *Vid. Psalter*, ii. 460–467.

in *v.* 8 declare what he, on the contrary, may and will do (lxvi. 13). Through the greatness and fulness of divine grace (lxix. 14), he has access (εἴσοδον, for בּוֹא means "to enter") to the sanctuary, and this he will visit even to-day. What is meant is the tent upon Zion, within which was the ark of the covenant. It must be presupposed that there was daily liturgical service there, for the ark of the covenant is the sign and pledge of Jahve's presence; and this assumption is also confirmed by 1 Chron. xvi. 37 *ff.* It is even to be taken for granted that daily sacrifices were offered before this tent. For it must not be inferred from 1 Chron. xvi. 39 *ff.* that it was only upon the high place at Gibeon and before the Mosaic tabernacle there that sacrifice was regularly offered.[1] It is true, sacrifice was offered at Gibeon, where the old tent and the old altars, at least the altar of burnt-offering, still were; and even after the ark of the covenant was removed to Zion, David (1 Chron. xxi. 29 *f.*) as well as Solomon (1 Kings iii. 4; 2 Chron. i. 2–6) offered sacrifices at Gibeon. But where the ark of the covenant was, sacrifice might surely be offered with still greater right than at Gibeon; and seeing that David, upon its arrival in Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi. 17 *f.*), as well as Solomon, upon his accession to the throne (1 Kings iii. 15), brought sacrifices before it by means of the priests appointed there, it is probable, and, admitting the testimony of the Davidic Psalms, even indubitable, that there was a daily service, combined with sacrifice, before the ark of the covenant on Zion. But is it really the אֹהֶל on Zion that is meant here in *v.* 8 by the house of God? It is maintained, that the tent which was pitched by David for the sacred ark is never called בית ה׳ or היכל or משכן ה׳ or מקדּשׁ or קדשׁ. But why should it not have borne all these names? The house of God in Shiloh, which is called בית and היכל ה׳ (1 Sam. i. 9,

[1] So especially Stähelin, *Zur Kritik der Psalmen*, in *D. M. Z.*, vol. vi. (1852), p. 108, and *Zur Einleitung in die Psalmen*, an academical programme, 1859, 4to.

iii. 3), was no doubt a temple rather than a tent[1] (although even in 1 Sam. ii. 22 it is also called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד), and in such passages as Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26 the future temple floats before the mind of the lawgiver; but in Josh. vi. 24, 2 Sam. xii. 20, the sanctuary is called בית ה׳, without being represented as a temple. And why should not the tabernacle, which David erected for the ark when it was transferred to Zion (2 Sam. vi. 17), be called בית ה׳ ? It is only when אֹהֶל and בַּיִת are contrasted with one another that the latter comes to mean a dwelling that is constructed of somewhat solid material; but by itself *beit* (*bêt*) is in Semitic the generic term for a habitation of every kind, whether it be formed of wool, felt, and haircloth, or earth, wood, and stone; it therefore signifies tent just as well as house (in the narrower sense), whether the latter be a hovel built of mud and wood or a palace.[2] If a dwelling-house is frequently called אהל, so much the more naturally may the tent in which one dwells be called his בַּיִת; and as a matter of fact, the abode of the patriarchs, although it was not commonly a solid house (Gen. xxxiii. 17), is called בַּיִת (Gen. xxvii. 15). Even הֵיכָל (according to Oppert's discovery the Accadian *ê-gal*, = *domus magna*, although as a Semitic word it reminds one of the root כל, *capacem esse*), while signifying a palace, does not

[1] *Vid.* C. H. Graf, *Commentatio de templo Silonensi ad illustrandum locum Jud.* xviii. 30, 31. 1855, 4to.

[2] The Turkish *Ḳâmûs* says: "بيت is house (Turk. *ew*) in the sense of *châne* (Pers. the same), whether it is made of hair, and is therefore a tent, or is built of stone and bricks." And further on: "originally *beit* signifies the place which is specially set apart, in order that men may withdraw to it at night [from بَاتَ, he has passed the night, if not perhaps from בוא, Arab. بَيَّ, which stands alongside of it in our passage; *vid. Job*, p. 461–63] ; later, however, the meaning was extended, and the special reference to the night time has dropped off." Even in the present day the Bedouin calls his tent, not *ahl*, but always *bêt*, and indeed *bêt scha'r* (בֵּית שָׂעָר), the later expression for the older *bêt wabar* (hair-house).

necessarily mean one that is built of stone, for heaven is also called Jahve's הֵיכָל (*e.g.* xviii. 7); nor does it necessarily signify one that is colossal in size, for even the Holy of holies of the Salomonic temple, and it especially, is called הֵיכָל, and once (1 Kings vi. 3) הֵיכַל הַבַּיִת. We have, moreover, no knowledge as to the size and general structure of the Davidic tabernacle; it was certainly splendid, and was a substitute, not so much for the tabernacle which, according to the testimony of the Chronicler, remained in Gibeon, as for the temple that had still to be built. But let it have been ever so mean, still Jahve was enthroned there; it was therefore the היכל of a great King, just as the unwalled spot in the open field, where God revealed Himself along with His angels to the homeless Jacob, was בֵּית אֱלֹהִים (Gen. xxviii. 17). Into this tent-house of his God, viz. into its forecourt, David will enter (בּוֹא with *accus.* as in lxvi. 13) this morning; there he will worship, prostrating himself, *προσκυνεῖν* (הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, reflexive of the Pilel שִׁחֲוָה, Ges., § 75, remark 18) towards (אֶל, as in xxviii. 2; 1 Kings viii. 29, 35; cf. לְ in xcix. 5, 9) Jahve's הֵיכַל קָדְשׁ, *i.e.* the דְּבִיר, the Holy of holies (xxviii. 2), and indeed "in Thy fear," *i.e.* in reverence before Thee (*gen. objectivus*). The journey to the temple, which David purposes, leads him to think of his journey through life, and this determines the form that is given to the special δέησις, which begins here; as in xxvii. 11, lxxxvi. 11, etc., he prays for God's gracious guidance. The direction of God, by which he desires to be guided, he calls צְדָקָה. This term signifies in general the determination of one's conduct in conformity with an ethical rule. The rule, in accordance with His observance of which God is pre-eminently called צדיק, is the plan of salvation, which opens up to the sinner the way of grace. When God forgives such as walk in this way, and stands by them to bless and to protect them, He shows Himself not less צדיק than when, in the jealous anger of His rejected love, He destroys those that despise Him. David prays

that he may be led by this righteousness, which is in accordance with the counsel and order of grace, לְמַעַן שׁוֹרְרָי, in order that the malicious desire of those that lie in wait for him may not be fulfilled, but put to shame, and that the glory of God may not be sullied by him. שׁוֹרֵר is equivalent to מְשׁוֹרֵר (Aq. ἐφοδεύων, Jer. *insidiator*), from the *Pilel* שׁוֹרֵר, to fix one's eyes sharply upon, used especially of observing in a hostile spirit (from the *Kal* שׁוּר, שָׁר, *fut. i, ire*, and more especially *spectatum ire*, whence סִיר, *spectaculum*). David beseeches further that God would make His way, *i.e.* the way in which man has to walk according to the will of God, plain and straight before him, the suppliant, so that he may walk therein without erring and without being hindered. The adj. יָשָׁר signifies the straightness of the line as well as the evenness of the surface. In Prov. iv. 25 the *impf.* of the *Hiph.* הִישִׁיר is יַיְשִׁיר, and accordingly the *Kerî* here substitutes for the *imper.* הַיְשַׁר the corresponding form הַיְשַׁר, just as in Isa. xlv. 2 it removes the *Hiphil* form אוֹשִׁר (cf. Gen. viii. 17, הוֹצִא, *Kerî* הַיְצֵא). The כִּי of *v.* 10 is connected with למען שׁוֹרְרָי: because of those that lie in wait for me; for their character is as follows. אֵין is separated from נְכוֹנָה by בְּפִיהוּ (= בְּפִיו, lxii. 5), which was so much the more easily possible as the usage of the language has almost entirely forgotten that אֵין is the construct of אַיִן (Ges., § 152, 1). In his mouth there is nothing that could stand firm, hold its ground, remain consistent with itself (cf. Job xlii. 7 *f.*). The singular suffix of בפיהו is meant distributively: *in ore uniuscujusque eorum*. Accordingly the *sing.* passes over at once into the *plur.*: קִרְבָּם הַוּוֹת; their inward part, *i.e.* that towards which it is directed and wherein it issues (*vid.* xlix. 12), is הוות, destruction, from הָוָה, which (being derived from הָוָה = פָּוַי, to gape, to yawn, χαίνειν, *hiare*) signifies, first, the yawning abyss, the gaping vacuum, and then, seeing that the verbal significations: *libere ferri* (especially from above down-

wards) and more particularly *animo ad* or *in aliquid ferri* are developed from the primary notion of empty space, comes to have the pathological meaning of appetite, lust, passion, as well as the intellectual sense of thinking in a loose way, and forming opinions in accordance with one's own capricious pleasure.[1] In Hebrew the predominant meaning of the word is destruction (lvii. 2), which is a metaphor for the abyss, *barathrum* (so far, but only so far, Schultens on Prov. x. 3 is right); starting from this meaning, it denotes that which is corruptible physically (Job vi. 30) as well as that which is corruptible from the ethical point of view (so here and frequently); in the signification, lust, desire, in which sense הַוָּה looks as if it differed from אַוָּה merely in sound, it occurs only in lii. 9, Prov. x. 3, Mic. vii. 3. Accordingly the meaning is: the contents of their inward part are destructive and corruptible materials of every kind, and their throat, conceived of as an organ of speech (as in cxv. 7, cxlix. 6; cf. lxix. 4), is a grave,—a figure possibly connected with the primary meaning of הוות,—which gapes like a maw, which opens in order to seize and swallow. To this there is added, as a circumstantial clause, "their tongue they make smooth" (for the structure, cf. iv. 3, lxii. 5, Isa. i. 5, in which the verb stands first, here, the object, because the tongue is contrasted with the palate as being a more external organ of speech). Their throat is already thus formed and adjusted; whereas they make smooth their tongue (cf. Prov. ii. 16), in order to conceal their real design under flattering words. Hence הֶחֱלִיק comes directly to signify "to flatter" (xxxvi. 3; Prov. xxix. 5). The two last lines of the strophe are formed after the scheme of the cæsura. This is also continued in the concluding strophe.

Vers. 11–13. The verb אָשַׁם or אָשֵׁם unites in itself the three closely connected meanings, to be guilty (Lev. v. 19),

[1] *Vid.* Fleischer on Job xxxvii. 6; cf. Ethé, *Schlafgemach der Phantasie* (1868), ii. p. 6*f.*

to be conscious of guilt (Lev. v. 4 *f.*), and to expiate guilt (Ps. xxxiv. 22 *f.*), just as the verbal adj. אָשֵׁם also signifies both liable to punishment and expiating, and the substantive אָשָׁם both the guilt to be expiated and the expiation. Accordingly the *Hiph.* הֶאֱשִׁים signifies to cause any one to render the expiation appropriate to his guilt, to make him pay the penalty. Here, in the midst of the Jehovistic Psalm, God is exceptionally called אֱלֹהִים; probably not without design He is directly called God the Judge. The מִן of מִמֹּעֲצֹתֵיהֶם (with *Gaja* by the מִן and a transition of the countertone *Metheg* into *Galgal* as in Hos. xi. 6 into *Meajla*) is in Hos. xi. 6 undoubtedly that of the cause; here, however, it is to be explained with Olsh. and Hitz., after the analogy of Sir. xiv. 2, Judith xi. 6 (cf. Hos. x. 6): may they fall away from their counsels, *i.e.*, break down in the carrying of them out. Here, therefore, מִן is used in the sense of "down from, away from," a sense which the parallel הַדִּיחֵמוֹ, thrust them forth (cf. דָּחוּ from דָּחָה, xxxvi. 13), also presupposes. The ב of בְּרֹב is to be understood in accordance with John viii. 21, 24, "ye shall die *ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*." The multitude of their transgressions is to remain unforgiven, and in this condition God is to push them down into Hades. This terrible petition is grounded by כִּי מָרוּ בָךְ. For a rhythmical reason (cf. *e.g.* xxxvii. 40, lxiv. 11, lxxii. 17) the tone of מָרוּ is drawn back to the penult. מָרָה, from the root מר, signifies literally to make and hold one's self stiff against any one; cf. تمارّ, مارّ, to bear up against one another, to stiffen against one another, in wrestling, تمارى, مارى, to struggle against anything by means of an outward or inward contradiction. Their contumacy is not contumacy against a man, but against God Himself; their sin is therefore Satanic and consequently unpardonable. Such petitions always proceed upon the presupposition expressed in vii. 13, the presupposition, viz. that those against whom they are directed reject God's grace. Accordingly their removal is prayed

for. Their removal makes the *ecclesia pressa* free and therefore joyous. The prospect of the success of these petitions gives rise to the prayer in *v.* 12. The *impff.* are not an expression of desire, but of sequence. The verse, however, is wrongly divided. The accentual rise of the first half of the verse closes with בָּךְ (pausal form with *Pazer*), לעולם ירננו is its fall; then the rise begins anew in the second half and extends to בך, which should likewise be vocalised בָּךְ, and אהבי שׁמך is its fall. In this train of thought it is difficult to assign a suitable meaning to וְתָסֵךְ עָלֵימוֹ (from הָסֵךְ, *Hiph.* of סָכַךְ, xci. 4). Hupf. and Hitz. render it: "they ever shout for joy whom Thou defendest"; but in order to bring out this meaning we must not only punctuate יְרַנְּנוּ, but also obliterate ו, and moreover there is nothing to indicate that תסך עלימו is a virtual subject. On the other hand, it does not fit in well with the other *impff.* of sequence. It must, therefore, like יִפְלוּ, be optative: "and do Thou defend them, so shall they that love Thy name be joyful in Thee." This joy of those that love the name of Jahve (lxix. 37, cxix. 132), *i.e.* who love God as made known in the history of redemption, is then grounded by כִּי־אַתָּה upon the fact of universal experience, which is the sum of all the testimonies He has borne to Himself in history. עָלֵימוֹ stands solemnly for עֲלֵיהֶם, just as הַדִּיחֵמוֹ stands indignantly for הַדִּיחֵם. In order to render the rhythm lighter, the form יַעְלְצוּ (Ges., § 63, 3) is chosen instead of יַעֲלֹצוּ (xxv. 2, lxviii. 4). The *impff.* are meant in a continuative sense; תַּעְטְרֶנּוּ, *cinges eum*, is not, as in 1 Sam. xvii. 25, an abbreviated *Hiph.*, but, as in 1 Sam. xxiii. 26, *Kal*, here, like the *Piel* in viii. 6, with a double accusative. The צִנָּה (from צָנַן, = صان *med. Waw*, Ethiop. in the intensive form *ṣawwana*, to hedge round, to guard) is a shield of the largest size, larger than מָגֵן (1 Kings x. 16 *f.*; cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 7, where Goliath causes his צִנָּה to be borne before him by a shield-bearer). כַּצִּנָּה, "like to a shield," is equivalent to "as with a shield," (Ges., § 118, remark 3). The

divine name, יהוה, is rightly drawn by the accentuation to the second member of the verse, in order to make it balance with the first, which, for the same reason, does not begin as elsewhere with כי־אתה יהוה (iv. 9, xii. 8). רָצוֹן, delight, satisfaction, goodwill, is a synonym for the divine blessing also in Deut. xxxiii. 23.

PSALM VI.

A CRY FOR GRACE UNDER JUDGMENT.

2 Jahve, do not in Thine anger punish me,
Neither in Thy wrath chastise me!
3 Be gracious unto me, for I am withered away;
Heal me, Jahve, for my bones are affrighted,
4 And my soul is affrighted exceedingly,—
And Thou, O Jahve, how long?

5 Return, Jahve, deliver my soul,
Save me, for Thy mercy's sake.
6 For in Death there is no mention of Thee,
In Sheôl who could give Thee thanks?
7 I am exhausted with my groaning,
Every night make I my bed to swim—
With my tears I melt away my couch.
8 Mine eye is wasted away because of grief,
It has grown old by reason of all mine adversaries.

9 Away from me, all ye that work iniquity!
For Jahve hath heard my loud weeping.
10 Jahve hath heard my supplication:
Jahve will receive my prayer.
11 Ashamed and sore affrighted shall be all mine enemies,
They turn back full of shame suddenly.

The morning prayer, Ps. v., is followed by a "*Psalm of David*," which, though not composed on a morning, nevertheless looks back upon sleepless, tearful nights. It consists of three strophes. In the middle one, which is about a third longer than the others, the poet, by means of a more tranquil pouring out of his heart, forces his way from the

cry of anguish in the first strophe to the believing confidence of the last. The hostility of men appears to him as a punishment inflicted by the wrath of God and, therefore (though in our Psalm this thought is not expressed so forcibly as in Ps. xxxviii., its counterpart), as the consequence of his sin, and the distress caused by this persecution, which to his mind has God's wrath as its background and sin as its sting, makes him miserable and sick even unto death. Seeing that the Psalm contains no confession of sin, one might think that the Church has erred in making it the first of the seven *Psalmi pœnitentiales* (vi., xxxii., xxxviii., li., cii., cxxx., cxliii.), a number probably selected with reference to the seven days of the week. In his *Introductio in Psalterium*, A. H. Francke says it is rather *Psalmus precatorius hominis gravissime tentati a pœnitente probe distinguendi.* This, however, is a mistake. One who is tempted and a penitent are distinguished by this, that the feeling of wrath which burdens the heart of the former is baseless, while that of the latter is well grounded. Job was such a tempted one. Our psalmist, however, is a penitent, who wrestles in prayer, that the punitive chastisement of God, the righteous One, may in his case be changed into the loving chastisement of God, the gracious One.

We detect here the language of penitently believing prayer that was coined by David; cf. *v.* 2 with xxxviii. 2; *v.* 3 with xli. 5; *v.* 5 with cix. 26; *v.* 6 with xxx. 10; *v.* 7 with lxix. 4; *v.* 8 with xxxi. 10; *v.* 11 with xxxv. 4, 26. The language of the Psalm of Heman is markedly different; cf. *v.* 6 with lxxxviii. 11–13; *v.* 8 with lxxxviii. 10. And the resemblances in Jeremiah (cf. *v.* 2 and xxxviii. 2 with Jer. *x.* 24; *vv.* 3 and 5 with Jer. xvii. 14; *v.* 7 with Jer. xlv. 3) are echoes, which prove to us the greater antiquity of the Psalm, and not that it was composed by the prophet (Hitz). Jeremiah's almost anthological relation to the earlier literature makes it exceedingly probable that in the case before us also

he is the reproducer; and we are confirmed in this opinion by the circumstance, that in x. 25 (after the resemblance to our Psalm to which we have just referred) he continues in words taken from Ps. lxxix. 6 *f.* And when Hitzig maintains that David could no more have written this exceedingly faint-hearted Psalm than Isaiah the words of Isa. xxi. 3, 4, we, on the other hand, point to Isa. xxii. 4, and to the many testimonies to the fact that David wept (2 Sam. i. 12, iii. 32, xii. 21, xv. 30, xix. 1).

The musical marginal note runs: *For the Musician with an accompaniment of stringed instruments, upon the octave.* The LXX. translates: ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης, which the Fathers think refers to the octave of the blessedness of eternity; ἡ ὀγδόη ἐκείνη, as Gregory of Nyssa says, ἥτίς ἐστιν ὁ ἐφεξῆς αἰών (cf. Bar-Hebræus; *D. M. Z.*, xxix. 288 *f.*, 294 *f.*). But there can be no doubt that עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית has a musical signification. It is also found in Ps. xii. and in 1 Chron. xv. 21. From the latter passage it is at least clear that it is not the name of an instrument. A stringed instrument with eight strings could not very well be called an octave instead of an octachord. It is stated there that they played with psalteries, עַל־עֲלָמוֹת, and with citherns, עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית. If עֲלָמוֹת, maidens, *i.e.* maiden's voices, denotes the soprano, then it would seem that הַשְּׁמִינִית denotes the bass, and that על־חשמינית is equivalent to *all' ottava bassa.* It is in keeping with this explanation, that Ps. xlvi., which has the marginal note על־עלמות, is a jubilant hymn, whereas Ps. vi. is plaintive and Ps. xii. not less gloomy and sad. The two latter were to be played in the lower octave, the former in the higher.

Vers. 2–4. There is a chastisement, which proceeds from God's love to man as enjoying His favour, and which has in view his moral cleansing or preservation; and there is a chastisement, which proceeds from God's wrath against man as stiff-neckedly resisting His grace or fallen away from it, and which renders satisfaction to the divine righteousness.

Pss. xciv. 12, cxviii. 17, and Prov. iii. 11 *f.* speak of the former, the chastisement in love. The man who should decline it would act contrary to his own weal. Accordingly David, like Jeremiah (x. 24), prays, not for the averting of the chastisement, but of the chastisement *in wrath*, or, what is the same thing, of the wrathful judgment. בְּאַפְּךָ and בַּחֲמָתְךָ stand emphatically between אַל and the respective verbs. Hengstenberg indeed finds a different antithesis here. "The antithesis," he says, "is not that of chastisement in love and chastisement in wrath; it is the antithesis of loving deliverance and chastisement, which latter always proceeds from the principle of wrath." If this means that, whenever God chastises a man, His wrath is the true and real reason for doing so, this is an error, for the refutation of which one whole book of the Bible, viz. the Book of Job, was written; for in it Job's friends are of opinion that God is angry with him, while we know from the prologue that, so far from being angry, He rather glories in him. Here in our Psalm, assuming David to be its author and his adultery its occasion, the case is certainly different. The chastisement, under which David is languishing, has God's wrath as its reason: it is punitive chastisement and remains such, so long as David remains fallen away from grace. When, however, he once more in sincere penitence wrestles through to grace, the punitive chastisement becomes the chastisement of love: the relation in which God stands to him becomes essentially different; the evil, which is the consequence of his sin, and, as such, certainly originates in the principle of wrath, becomes a means whereby love educates and purifies him. It is this that he here beseeches for himself, as Dante[1] paraphrases it:

Signor, non mi riprender con furore,
E non voler correggermi con ira,
Ma con dolcezza e con perfetto amore.

[1] Provided he is the author of *i sêtte Salmi Penitenziali trasportati alla volgar poesia*. *Vid.* Dante Alighieri's *Lyrische Gedichte*, translated and

In חָנֵּנִי David prays that God would show him favour, mildness and lenity instead of strict penal justice; for anguish of soul has already brought him into a condition of utter languishment even as regards his bodily life: he is altogether languid and weary. אֻמְלָל has *Pathach*, and seems therefore to be 3*rd pr. Pul.* (as in Joel i. 10; Nah. i. 4); but this is syntactically impossible. It is an adj. like שֻׁאֲנָן, רֻעֲנָן with the passive vocalization. The formation אמלל (from אמל, أمل, with the primary meaning, to stretch far, far out) is analogous to forms ix. and xi. of the Arabic verb, which serve specially to describe colours and defects. The two words אֻמְלַל אָנִי have together the double accent *Mercha-Mahpach*, and according to the exact way of writing the *Mahpach* (the sign resembling *Mahpach* or rather *Jethib*) has to stand between the two words, inasmuch as it at the same time takes the place of *Makkef*. The principal tone of the united couple of words lies, therefore, upon the *āni;* and accordingly the adj. אֻמְלָל is here pronounced more shortly אֻמְלַל (cf. הַפְכְּפָךְ, אֲדַמְדָּם, מְרֻמָּס, and the like), a shortening which proves that אמלל is not treated as *part. Pul.* (=מְאֻמְלָל; cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 247 *f.*), for the characteristic *ā* of the latter is unchangeable. In Ezek. ix. 8 also, the strangely written and punctuated ונאשאר is by no means a participle. His prayer for healing is based upon the fact that his bones (Job. iv. 14; Isa. xxxviii. 13) are affrighted. נִבְהַל (starting from the primary meaning "to set loose, let go"; cog. בָּלַהּ) denotes as well the condition of outward overthrow as of inward consternation, and therefore the effect that is produced by terror, which puts one into a state of mental confusion, and by excitement, which renders one unstable and weak. His soul is still more shaken than

annotated by Kannegiesser and Witte (1842) i. 203 *ff.*, ii. 208 *ff.* Three Protestant workmen in a coalpit at Borinage sang this sixth Psalm (*Seigneur, qui vois ma peine*) while looking forward to death by suffocation; ever since it has been called *le Psaume des Brulés; vid.* the Belgian magazine, *L'Union Protestante*, 1867, No. 4.

his body. His affliction is therefore not merely bodily sickness, in which only a coward becomes faint-hearted. God's love has hidden itself from him. God's wrath appears to be about to destroy him altogether. It is an affliction beyond all afflictions. Accordingly he enquires: and Thou, Jahve, how long? Instead of אתה, את is written; this the *Kerî* bids us read אַתָּה; while in three places (Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24; Ezek. xxviii. 14) אַתְּ is admitted as *masc.* מָתַי (like עָדַי, עָלַי, the primary forms of עֲדֵי, עֲלֵי), from מָתָה (cog. מוּד, whence תָּמִיד), signifies literally extension, continuance, length of time.

Vers. 5–8. God has averted Himself from him; hence the petition שׁוּבָה, viz. אֵלַי. The tone of שׁוּבָה lies upon the ultimate, because the reading שׁוּבָה אֲדֹנָי is presupposed (*vid.* on iii. 8). Oh that God would turn towards him once more; oh that He would deliver (חַלְּצָה from חלץ, which is transitive in Heb. and Aram., to set free, *expedire*, *exuere*, Arab. خَلَصَ, to be whole and pure; strictly, to be loose, free) his soul, in which his affliction is rooted, from this affliction, and cause him to experience redemption on the ground of His grace towards sinners. He bases this cry for help upon his longing to be able still longer to praise God, a blessed occupation, the possibility of which would be denied him were he dead. זֵכֶר, like הַזְכִּיר frequently, is used here of a remembering that honours and praises its object. הוֹדָה (from יָדָה) has along with it the *dat. honoris*. In 6 *b*, שְׁאוֹל, ᾅδης (Apoc. xx. 13), is used instead of מָוֶת. This is the name given to the subterranean land of the dead,[1] whose gate is the grave, the yawning abyss, into which everything that is mortal descends (from שְׁאַל = שׁוּל, سال, to be limp, slack, to hang down, to sink down: the depression, that which is sunken in, the deep). All the psalmists know only

[1] In Assyr. vocabularies the word is *šû-al* with *ki* as the determinative of the land. Cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 121.

of one single gathering-place of the dead in the depths of the earth, where they indeed live, but their life is only a *quasi* life, because they are cut off from the light of this world and, what is the most lamentable, from the light of the presence of God. Accordingly the Christian can join in the prayer of *v.* 6 of this Psalm and of similar passages (xxx. 10, lxxxviii. 11–13, cxv. 17, Isa. xxxviii. 18 *f.*) only so far as the notion of Hades is changed in his mind into that of Gehenna.[1] In hell there is really no thankful remembrance, no praise of God.[2] David's fear of death as of something in itself unhappy is also, in its ultimate ground, nothing else but the fear of an unhappy death. In such pains of hell he is exhausted by his groaning (בְּ, as in lxix. 4), and bedews his couch (עֶרֶשׂ, bed, from עָרַשׂ = عرش, the canopy of the bed) every night with a flood of tears. As the *Hiph.* הִשְׂחָה, from שָׂחָה, to swim, signifies "to float," so the *Hiph.* הִמְסָה, from מָסָה (cogn. מָסַס), to melt, signifies "to dissolve, cause to melt."[3] דִּמְעָה, in Arab. a *nom. unit.*, a tear, is in Hebrew a flood of tears. In *v.* 8 עֵינִי signifies, not my "appearance" (Num. xi. 7), but, as is evident from xxxi. 10, lxxxviii. 10, Job xvii. 7, my eye, the eye reflecting the general condition of a man's health. The verb עָשֵׁשׁ seems to be a denominative from עָשׁ: to become moth-eaten;[4]

[1] An adumbration of this relation of Christianity to the religion of the Old Testament is found in the relation of Islam to that of the Arab wandering tribes. The latter calls itself the "religion of Abraham" (*Din Ibrâhîm*), and knows of no life after death, whereas Islam has adopted from later Judaism and from Christianity the hope of a resurrection and of heavenly blessedness.

[2] Luther translates: Who will thank thee in hell? On this subject see the article of Kamphausen on the use of the word "*Hölle*" in the German translation of the Bible, especially in the New Test. and in the Psalms, *Theolog. Literaturblatt*, 1872, Nos. 6, 7.

[3] In Arab. also there is a verb (awanting in our lexicons) مسى *liquescere;* iv. *liquefacere;* vii. *liquefieri* (part. منمسى *liquefactus*).

[4] So Reuchlin in his grammatical analysis of the seven penitential

we can with greater confidence assign to the verb עָתַק the signification *senescere*. The closing words בְּכָל־צוֹרְרָי (cf. Num. x. 9 הַצֹּר הַצֹּרֵר, the adversary that oppresseth, from √צר, صر, to press, squeeze, and especially to lace together, *constringere*, *coartare*),[1] in which the poet indicates, partially at least, the cause of his sorrow (כַּעַס, in Job xvii. 7 כָּעַשׁ), are the link as it were to which the following strophe is attached.

Vers. 9–11. Even while he is still pouring forth his mournful prayer, as Frisch says in his "*Neuklingende Harfe Davids*," God's light and comfort fall suddenly into his heart. Enemies mock him as one whom God has forsaken, but even in the presence of his enemies he becomes conscious that such is not his case. In *vv.* 9 and 10 he thrice repeats, with upflashing confidence, that God hears him: He hears his tearful sobbing that cries aloud to heaven, He hears his supplication, He graciously receives his prayer. The twofold שָׁמַע expresses what has already actually happened, and יִקַּח, the inference that he draws from that fact. What he seems likely to have to suffer his enemies will really suffer, viz. the ruin that overtakes those who are rejected by God: they are put to shame. בּוֹשׁ, Syr. ܐܬܒ, Chal. בְּהַת, בְּהֵת which meets us here for the first time, is not connected with the Arab. بهت, but (since as a rule Old Arabic has ث as the consonant that is equivalent to שׁ and ∠, ת) with باث, which signifies "to turn up and scatter about things that lie together (beside or over one another)," *eruere et*

Psalms, with which he in 1512 followed up his *Ll.* iii. *de Rudimentis Hebraicis* (1506): עָשְׁשָׁה *Verminavit. Sic a vermibus dictum qui turbant res claras puras et nitidas.* In the *Rudim.*, on the other hand, he combines it with the Talmudic עֲשָׁשִׁית (lantern): *Turbatus est a furore oculus meus, corrosus et obfuscatus, quasi vitro laternæ obductus.*

[1] In Arab. צִיר, *dir*, is the name for a stepmother, as being the oppressor of her step-children, and צָרַר, *dirr*, the name for a concubine, as being the oppressor of her rival.

diruere, disturbare, a root which also appears in the stem بثّ (belonging to the class of verbs called *verba mediæ* or *secundæ radicalis geminatæ*, ע״ע): to turn up and disperse, whence بَثّ, sadness, and grief. Accordingly בּוּשׁ (= בָּוּשׁ, just as بَاثَّ = بَوَثَّ) properly signifies *disturbari, i.e.* to be made discordant, to lose one's self-command, and represents the being put to shame in much the same way as *confundi*, *συγχεῖσθαι*, *συγχύνεσθαι*: the idea being similar in all these expressions, only receiving a somewhat different turn in the Hebrew. In וְיִבָּהֲלוּ there is an allusion to *vv.* 2 and 3: the destiny, at which the malicious ones rejoiced, passes over to themselves. As יָשֻׁבוּ יֵבֹשׁוּ says, a superior authority hurls back the assailants filled with shame (ix. 4, xxxv. 4). What a calm close is formed by these three *Milels: jaschûbu jebôschu rāgaʿ*, as compared with the *tripudium* of the preceding words addressed to his enemies. In the course of his prayer the poet has attained to a firm hold of God; the mind that is confident in God, called in Isa. xxvi. 3 יְצַר סָמוּךְ, may be overheard giving utterance to itself in this trochaic cadence. And if it is not intentional, it is certainly a singular accident, that being put to shame follows the involuntary turning back of the enemies, and that in its letters and its sound יבֹשׁוּ is the reverse of יָשֻׁבוּ! How much music the Psalter contains! Would that composers understood it!!

PSALM VII.

APPEAL TO THE JUDGE OF THE WORLD AGAINST SLANDER AND REQUITING OF GOOD WITH EVIL.

2 Jahve, my God, in Thee hide I myself;
Save me from all my pursuers, and deliver me!
3 Lest he rend my soul like a lion,
Crushing it while there is none to deliver.

4 Jahve, my God, if I have done this,
If iniquity cling to my hands,

5 If I have wrought evil unto him that was at peace with me
And despoiled him that was without cause my foe:
6 Let the enemy pursue my soul and overtake
And tread my life down to the earth,
And lay my glory in the dust. [*Selah.*

7 Arise, Jahve, in Thine anger,
Lift up Thyself against the fury of mine oppressors
And awake for me; justice Thou hast indeed commanded!
8 And let the assemblage of the nations stand round about Thee,
And over it return Thou on high!
9 Jahve will judge peoples—
Jahve, judge me according to my righteousness and the innocence that is in me!

10 O that the wickedness of the wicked were come to an end; establish the righteous;
Thou art the trier of the hearts and reins, a righteous God.
11 Elohim beareth my shield,
The Saviour of the upright in heart.

12 Elohim is a righteous Judge,
And a God that threateneth every day.
13 If any repent not, He whetteth His sword;
He hath bent His bow and made it ready,
14 And against him He aimeth the weapons of death,
His arrows He maketh burning.

15 Behold, he travaileth with evil: he conceiveth mischief and bringeth forth falsehood.
16 A pit hath he excavated and dug it out,
And falleth into the hollow that he is making.
17 His mischief cometh back upon his own head,
And upon his own pate his violence descendeth.
18 I will thank Jahve according to His righteousness,
And will laud the name of Jahve, the Most High.

In the second half of Ps. vi. David confronted his foes, full of a lofty self-confidence in God; Ps. vii., which even Hitzig ascribes to David, treats of the same theme, and shows us the purity of his conscience and the joyousness of his faith by means of a striking example taken from the time when he was persecuted by Saul. We need only read 1 Sam. xxiv.–

xxvi., in order to see how rich in unmistakable allusions to this period of David's life our Psalm is. It is to this period that the statement in the title regarding its occasion also points. Such statements are found only in connection with Davidic Psalms.[1] The title runs: *Shiggaion of David, which he sang to Jahve because of the words of Cush a Benjamite.* עַל־דִּבְרֵי is purposely selected instead of the simple עַל, which has other functions in these titles. Although דָּבָר and דִּבְרֵי may mean a matter, business, affairs (Ex. xxii. 8; 1 Sam. x. 2, and freq.), and על־דברי, in respect of, concerning (Deut. iv. 21; Jer. vii. 22), or, on occasion of (Jer. xiv. 1), yet here, since the contents of the Psalm presuppose malicious slandering, we must abide by the most natural sense: "because of the words (speeches)." Cûsh (LXX. wrongly Χουσί = כּוּשִׁי; Luther: the Moor) must have been one of the many myrmidons of Saul, his fellow tribesman, one of the talebearers, like Doeg and the Ziphites, who shamefully calumniated David to Saul, and stirred up the latter against him. As the name of a person the word is of uncertain meaning; in post-biblical Hebrew כּוּשׁ signifies spindle (*vid.* on Prov. xxxi. 19). The epithet בֶּן־יְמִינִי (as in 1 Sam. ix. 1, 21; cf. אִישׁ יְמִינִי, 2 Sam. xx. 1) describes him as "a Benjamite"; it does not, however, presuppose acquaintance on the writer's part with him, as would have been the case had he written הַבִּנְיָמִינִי, or rather (in accordance with biblical usage) בֶּן־הַיְמִינִי; and as a matter of fact Scripture history is elsewhere silent regarding him. The statement על־דברי וגו׳ is hardly from David's hand, but is written by some one else, whether the writer may have derived it from tradition, or from the דברי הימים of David, where this Psalm may have been interwoven with the history of its occasion. On the other hand, there is nothing to

[1] *Viz.* vii., lix., lvi., xxxiv., lii., lvii., cxlii., liv. (belonging to the time when he was persecuted by Saul), iii., lxiii. (the time of Absalom's rebellion), xxx. (the dedication of the palace), li. (his adultery), lx. (the Syro-Ammonitish war). *Vid.* also Ps. xviii.

prevent us from regarding שִׁגָּיוֹן לְדָוִד, or at least שִׁגְיוֹן, as a marginal note written by David himself.

Seeing that שִׁגָּיוֹן (after the analogy of the form חִזָּיוֹן, vision) belongs to the same class of terms that are used in the titles as מִזְמוֹר and מַשְׂכִּיל, and Habakkuk's *Tefilla* (iii. 1 ; *vid.* my Commentary) has the note, עַל־שִׁגְיֹנוֹת, שִׁגְיוֹן must be the name of a kind of lyric poetry, a name, too, that is descriptive of it in accordance with the rhythms of its language or of the music to which it was sung. Now since שָׁגָה (Aram. שְׁגָא, Ethiop. *sâkuãja*) signifies to go astray, wander, reel or stagger, and is cognate with שָׁגַע, whence comes the similarly formed שִׁגָּעוֹן, madness, שִׁגְיוֹן may mean, in the language of prosody, a reeling poem, *i.e.* a poem which is recited under the most violent excitement, with a rapid change of the strongest emotions, and therefore a dithyrambus, and שִׁגְיֹנוֹת may denote the variously and violently mixed up dithyrambic rhythms. This is the view of Ewald and Rödiger; it was the view also of Turnov, Geier, and other old expositors, who translated it *cantio erratica*.[1] We expect, therefore, that this Psalm will consist, as Ainsworth (1627) puts it, "of *sundry variable and wandering verses*," that it will wander through a great variety of rhythms as if in a state of intoxication—and this is really the case. The accompanying music also contributed its part in producing this effect. The contents of the Psalm are also in keeping with this poetico-musical form. It is the most solemn pathos of exalted self-consciousness that is expressed in it. And it has this in common with Hab. iii., that it gives expression to the joy that arises from jealous wrath against God's enemies and from beholding their speedy overthrow. Painful unrest, defiant self-confidence, triumphant exultation, fearless trust, prophetic certainty—all these moods find expression in the irregular series of strophes that make up

[1] The LXX. render it in our passage with the colourless expression ψαλμός, and in Hab. iii. 1 with μετ' ᾠδῆς, which is also found in the title of the 15th of the Psalms of Solomon.

this Davidic dithyrambus, the ancient Purim Psalm (*Sofrim*, c 18 § 2).

Vers. 2, 3. With the word of faith, of love, and of hope, בְּךָ חָסִיתִי (as in cxli. 8), this holy *captatio benevolentiæ*, David begins also in xi. 1, xvi. 1, xxxi. 2; cf. lxxi. 1. The *perf.* is inchoative: in Thee have I taken my refuge, equivalent to: in Thee do I trust. The transition from the *plur.* in *v.* 2 (רֹדְפַי) to the *sing.* in *v.* 3 is explained most naturally, and most in keeping with the title, by supposing that the worst of the many who were persecuting him at that time presents himself to his mind. The verb טָרַף, starting from the primary meaning *carpere* (to which חָרַף answers still more exactly), signifies to tear off as well as to tear in pieces (whence טֶרֶף, that which is torn in pieces), and פָּרַק, with the primary meaning *frangere*, signifies to break off as well as to break in pieces, therefore to set free (as in cxxxvi. 24) and to break in small pieces (1 Kings xix. 11). His persecutors are conceived of as wild animals, as lions, which rend their prey in pieces and crunch its bones. So bloodthirsty are they for his soul, *i.e.* for his bodily life. After the painful unrest of this first strophe, the second strikes up the note of defiant self-consciousness.

Ver. 4–6. According to the title, זֹאת hints at the purport of those slanderous words of the Benjamite. With אִם־יֵשׁ־עָוֶל בְּכַפָּי we may compare David's words to Saul, אֵין בְּיָדִי רָעָה (1 Sam. xxiv. 12, xxvi. 18); the comparison will at the same time show us on a small scale the difference between the poetical and the prose form of expression. שִׁלַּמְתִּי (Targum, לְבַעַל שִׁלְמִי) he (referring to Saul) calls the man who stands upon a peaceful, friendly footing with him. It is from the verb שָׁלֵם, here used in the special signification, to be in complete concord, in undisturbed harmony and agreement with any one; cf. the adj. שָׁלוֹם (lv. 21) and אִישׁ שְׁלוֹמִי (xli. 10). The verb גָּמַל, cogn. גָּמַר, signifies originally to finish, accomplish, carry out (√גם, כם, cf. כִּימָה, to be or make full, to heap

up). They say גָּמַל טוֹב and גָּמַל רַע, and also without a material object גָּמַל עָלַי or גְּמָלַנִי, *benefecit* or *malefecit mihi*. Contrary to the prevalent accentuation, however, we follow the Targum in combining גְּמַלְתִּי with רָע, not with שִׁלְמִי (Olsh., Böttch, Hitz.), although שָׁלֵם as well as מְשַׁלֵּם (cf. דִּבֵּר in addition to מְדַבֵּר) might mean "requiting." Hupf. and Riehm also reject the interpretation: "if to him that requited me with evil I have wrought," viz. such a thing, *i.e.* the same evil. They are right in doing so; for with גמלתי one naturally expects a material object, and therefore רָע would have to stand for it. In 5 *b* we do not take חָלַץ in the sense in which it usually occurs and render it: "rather I rescued . . ." (Louis de Dieu, Ew., § 345 *a*, Hupf., Riehm). The parenthesis would be too short to lead over into a different tone from that in the three hypothetical clauses; it would also stand somewhat awkwardly immediately between the protasis and the apodosis; and it would begin with an *impf. consec.*, thereby making it difficult for us to recognise it as a parenthesis. Why should not חָלַץ, conformably with its primary signification, *expedire*, *exuere* (according to which even the signification, to rescue, taken exactly, does not proceed from the notion of drawing forth, but from that of untying, setting free, *exuere vinclis*), here, as in Aram., mean *exuere* = *spoliare*. And how admirably this suits as an allusion to the incident in the cave, where David did not rescue Saul, but cut off the skirt of his robe, without, however, having חֲלִיצָה, *exuviæ*, in view. As Hengstenberg remarks, "he makes the asseveration of his innocence in quite a general manner, thereby showing that his behaviour towards Saul was not something exceptional, but rooted in his whole disposition and mode of action." On the 1 *pers. impf. cons.* with *ah*, *vid.* on iii. 6. רֵיקָם belongs to צוֹרְרִי (cf. xxv. 3, lxix. 5). In the apodosis, *v.* 6, the *impf. Kal* of רָדַף is made to consist of three syllables in an unexampled manner; יִרְדֹּף is first formed from יִרְדֹּף by making the *Schebâ* vocal (like יִצְחַק, Gen.

xxi. 6, תְּהַלָּה, Ps. lxxiii. 9, Ex. ix. 23, שְׁמֻעָה, xxxix. 13), and is then sharpened by means of a euphonic *Dag. forte.*[1] Chajûg' holds the form to be a *Hithpa.* = יִתְרַדְּף, while Kimchi regards it as a mixed form from *Kal* and *Piel*[2] (cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 160 *f.*). This dactylic Jussive form of the *Kal* is followed by the regular Jussives of the *Hiph.*, יַשֵּׂג and יַשְׁבֵּן. The rhythm is similar to that in the original passage, Ex. xv. 9, which also re-echoes in xviii. 38, viz. iambic with an intermixture of anapæsts. From its parallelism with נַפְשִׁי and חַיַּי, כְּבוֹדִי obtains the signification, "my soul," a signification that is guaranteed to it by xvi. 9, xxx. 13, lvii. 9, cviii. 2, Gen. xlix. 6. Man's soul is his *doxa;* it is so, inasmuch as it is the image of the divine *doxa* (*Psychol.*, p. 98 and freq.). The expression "let him lay . . . in the dust" is also at least as favourable to this sense of כְּבוֹדִי, as to the sense of personal and official dignity (iii. 4, iv. 3). To lay in the dust is equivalent to, to lay in the dust of death (xxii. 16). שֹׁכְנֵי עָפָר (Isa. xxvi. 19) are the dead. According to the biblical view, the soul may be killed (Num. xxxv. 11) and is mortal (Num. xxiii. 10). It binds spirit and body together, and this bond is severed by death. David willingly submits to death, provided he has ever acted dishonourably. Here the music has to strike up in order to make the expression of this bold confession more emphatic. In the following strophe the asseveration of his innocence rises to a challenging appeal to the judgment of God, and to a prophetic certainty of the nearness of that judgment.

Vers. 7–9. In the consciousness of his own innocence he

[1] The *Dag.* is of the same kind as, among nouns, that in גַּמַּלִּים, and *farassi* (my horse) of vulgar Arabic. *Vid.* Wetzstein, *Inschriften*, p. 366.

[2] The view of Pinsker, that the pointing יִרְדֹּף is designed to leave the reader at liberty to chose between the readings יִרְדֹּף and יִרְדֵּף, proceeds upon the erroneous assumption, that the text in its present form here and there leaves open the possibility of a two-fold way of reading, and thus betrays a vacillation on the part of tradition.

calls upon Jahve to sit in judgment and to vindicate His own. His field of vision is enlarged, and embraces not only the enemies that are in his immediate neighbourhood, but also the world at large in its hostility to Jahve and His anointed one. Hupfeld is of opinion that the assembled nations are only to take the place of witnesses, in order to increase the solemnity of the process; and to this Riehm adds that the righteousness of him who has been shamefully misrepresented is to be vindicated before the whole world. But according to *v.* 9*a* it is the peoples themselves that are being judged. Similarly in the prophets also particular judgments and universal judgment are placed side by side upon the surface, as it were, of one painting. The truth of this way of looking at the two together lies in the fact, that the final judgment of the world is only the conclusion of that judgment of it which is being gradually executed throughout the whole of its history. Here the language takes the highest and most majestic flight conceivable. With קוּמָה (*Milra*, as in iii. 8), a precatory expression that David has taken from the mouth of Moses (ix. 20, x. 12), Jahve is summoned to interpose with His authority; הִנָּשֵׂא is parallel: lift up Thyself, show Thyself in Thy majesty (xciv. 2; Isa. xxxiii. 10). The anger, in which He is to stand up, is the principle of His punitive righteousness; with this anger of His He is to gird Himself (lxxvi. 11) against the violence of the oppressors of God's anointed one, *i.e.* He is to take vengeance upon them for their manifold and numerous manifestations of hostility. עַבְרוֹת is a secondary form of עֶבְרוֹת (Job xl. 11; cf. xxi. 30), from עֶבְרָה, which represents anger as breaking forth from within and passing over into word and deed (cf. Arab. فشّ, said of water: it overflows its dam; of anger: it boils over). To make מִשְׁפָּט the object of עוּרָה is not only contrary to the accentuation, but also contrary to the usage of the language, while it is far-fetched to take it (with Hitz.) as an accus. of direction = לְמִשְׁפָּט (xxxv. 23);

the accents rightly take עוּרָה אֵלַי together: awake up (bestir thyself) for me, *i.e.* to help me (אֵלַי like לִקְרָאתִי, lix. 5). That the following צִוִּיתָ is precative and equivalent to צַוֵּה: command judgment, is a view for which there is no warrant either here or in lxxi. 3. It ought at least to have been וְצִוִּיתָ with *waw consec.* On the other hand, it is admissible to take it relatively: Thou who hast commanded judgment (Maurer, Hengst.); but there is no need to do so. We take it by itself as containing the justification of his request; not, however, as a circumstantial clause: having commanded judgment (Ew., Riehm), but as a co-ordinate clause: Thou hast indeed enjoined the maintaining of right (Hupf.). The singer now, so to speak, arranges the judgment scene: the assemblage of the peoples (cf. Jer. vi. 18, where עֵדָה seems to have the same sense) is to form a circle around Jahve, in the centre of which He sits in judgment; and after the judgment has been held He is to soar away over them (Gen. xvii. 22), and return on high to heaven, like one who returns in triumph after the battle (*vid.* lxviii. 19). Although it is certainly surprising to find no particular expression for the holding of the judgment itself, yet the interpretation of Hupfeld and others: seat Thyself again upon Thy judgment throne in heaven in order to judge, is to be rejected on account of the שׁוּבָה, which is not suited to this sense (cf. on the other hand xxi. 14); שׁוּב לַמָּרוֹם can only mean the return of Jahve to His blissful rest after judgment has been executed. That which *vv.* 7 and 8 long for with daring faith, the beginning of *v.* 9 expresses as a prophetic hope; and from this hope the petition again proceeds, that the Judge of the earth may also vindicate him (שָׁפְטֵנִי *vindica me*, as in xxvi. 1, xxxv. 24) in accordance with his righteousness, and the purity of which he is conscious, the purity that dwells in him. עָלַי is to be closely connected with תֻּמִּי, just as one says נַפְשִׁי עָלַי (*Psychol.*, p. 152). Whatever the personality as *ego*, as subject, distinguishes from itself as being something to

be found in it, it represents by עָלַי. To explain it elliptically: "be it unto me" (Ew., Olsh., Hupf.), is to ignore this psychologically fine usage of the language. On תֹּם *vid.* on xxv. 21, xxvi. 1.

Vers. 10, 11. This strophe speaks the calm language of courageous trust, language to which the gradually rising and subsiding scheme of the cæsura is admirably adapted. It is the cessation of evil with which the psalmist has now to do: Oh that it would come to an end (גָּמַר intr. as in xii. 2, lxxvii. 9),—his prayer is therefore not directed against the persons as such, but against the evil that is in them. This Psalm is the key to all the Psalms that contain prayers against foes. וּתְכוֹנֵן, one of the comparatively rare voluntatives of the 2nd pers. (Ew., § 229), is also meant optatively: "and that thou wouldest establish . . .;" to the longed-for cessation of evil there corresponds, positively, the longed-for securing and confirming of the righteous, whom evil endangers and whose stability it tends to undermine. With וּבֹחֵן there begins a circumstantial clause, introduced by ו, but without a personal pronoun, which is not seldom wanting in the principal participial clause (as in Isa. xxix. 8, which see) as well as in the subordinate participial clause, as here (cf. lv. 20): *cum sis = quoniam es.*[1] The reins are the seat of the emotions, just as the heart is the seat of the thoughts and affections. Reins and heart lie naked before God—a designation of the only καρδιογνώστης that recurs in Jer. xi. 20, xvii. 10, xx. 12, Apoc. ii. 23. The verb בָּחַן, starting from the primary signification to rub (محن) and to test by rubbing (cf. بَرَى; *vid.* on Ps. cxxxix. 3), means to know accurately by means of experience. With אֱלֹהִים in the fall of the rhythm the adjective is combined in the *sing.*

[1] The 3rd *perf.* קָמַל is also equivalent to "killing," viz. he (*vid.* Philippi, *Status constr.*, p. 168), although the Arab. grammarians regard it as neuter, or rather deny that it implies its subject in itself.

as in lxxviii. 56 (cf. lviii. 12). God is the righteous One, and in virtue of His knowledge of the heart He is perfectly able to prove Himself righteous in anger as well as righteous in grace, according to the requirements of each several case. Therefore David can confidently add: מָגִנִּי עַל-אֱלֹהִים, God beareth my shield; לְ (lxxxix. 19) would signify: He has it, it (my shield) belongs to Him, whereas עַל (1 Chron. xviii. 7) signifies: He bears it, or, if we take shield in the sense of protection: He has taken my protection upon Himself, has undertaken it (as in lxii. 8; cf. lvi. 13; Judg. xix. 20), just as He is in general the Saviour of those who are devoted to Him with a straight, *i.e.* upright, sincere heart (cf. xxxii. 11 with *v.* 2). צַדִּיק is designedly repeated at the end of both the first lines of the strophe—the favourite palindrome especially in Isa. xl.–lxvi. And that this Psalm is at once Elohistic and Jehovistic belongs also to its mixed (chromatic) character. From the calm language of heartfelt surrender to God the following strophe passes over into that of earnest warning, the language resembling that of a didactic poem and again becoming somewhat more vehement.

Vers. 12–14. If in the end God lets His anger break forth, He does so not without having previously threatened every day, viz. the godless (cf. Isa. lxvi. 14; Mal. i. 4). The verb זָעַם is explained by means of the Arab. زَعَمَ, which signifies the bellowing of an infuriated animal and the speaking of an enraged man. God is continually making the godless man feel his זעם, *i.e.* His, the angry One's, threatening, in order to fill him with a salutary dread. The subject of the conditional clause, אִם-לֹא יָשׁוּב, is any godless one whatever; and the subject of the principal clause, as its continuation in *v.* 14 shows, is God. If one (they) do not repent, then Jahve whets His sword (cf. Deut. xxxii. 41). This sense of the words is in keeping with the context; whereas if we render them: "surely He (Elohim) again whets His sword"

(Böttch., Ew., Hupf.—the latter, however, only in the translation prefixed to his exposition, not in the exposition itself), יָשׁוּב, which moreover should stand with nothing between it and יִלְטֹשׁ (cf. *e.g.* Gen. xxx. 31), is meaningless and the asseverating אִם־לֹא without any adequate motive. As the *impf.* states, the penal judgment is being gradually prepared; on the other hand, however, as the *perff.* state, it is also like a bow that is already bent against the sinner with an arrow aiming at him, so that it can be executed at any moment. כּוֹנַן, to make ready, is followed by הֵכִין, to aim. לוֹ, referring to the sinner, stands emphatically at the commencement of the verse (as in Gen. xlix. 10; 1 Sam. ii. 3), and is equivalent to אֵלָיו (Ezek. iv. 3). If meant to be reflexive (Olsh., Ew., and others), or if referring to the bow (Jer.), it would not precede its verb; and indeed, why in either of these cases should it occur at all? "Burning" arrows are fire-arrows (זִקִּים, זִיקוֹת, from זָנַק, נזק, to jerk off); and God's fire-arrows are the lightnings which He hurls forth (xviii. 15; Zech. ix. 14). דָּלַק, to burn, goes back, as the Arab. ذلق shows (*vid.* on Prov. xxvi. 23), upon the notion of the unsteady flickering to and fro (√דל) of a flame. The *impf.* יִפְעָל denotes the simultaneous feeding of the arrows that are aimed at the sinner with fire of wrath. The incident with Cush is generalised: the manifold energy of the divine wrath, the immediate outbreak of which only the divine forbearance restrains, is symbolised by sword and arrow. The representation is not grossly sensuous; but the vividness of the idea naturally leads to its embodiment in a material form.

Vers. 15–18. This concluding strophe, as if dictating a judicial sentence, prophesies to the enemy of God what awaits him; it also closes with an anticipation of thanks and praise. Man brings forth what he has conceived, he reaps what he has sown. Under these figures of הָרָה and יָלַד (הוֹלִיד, חֵיל, חֹבֶל), זֶרַע and קָצַר, the punishment that sin naturally and

inevitably involves is frequently represented, first in this the primary passage, and then in Job xv. 35: the act of sin, its guilt and punishment appear in general as notions that pass over into one another. David sees in the sin of his enemies their self-destruction. It is surprising that travail is first spoken of and that pregnancy is mentioned secondly; for חָבַל does not signify, to conceive (Hitz.), but as in Cant. viii. 5, ὠδίνειν; nor does the Arab. *ḥabila* (synon. with *ḥamala*) signify "to conceive" as distinguished from "to be pregnant," but both: to be pregnant, and to become pregnant. The accentuation already points to the correct relationship of the three members of the sentence. First of all it is said in quite a general way: behold he shall travail with, *i.e.* as if writhing in birth-pangs he shall bring forth, אָוֶן, evil, as the natural result of his wickedness. Then, this thought being analysed into its two factors (Hupf.), the sentence proceeds: he shall namely conceive (*concipere*) עָמָל and give birth to שֶׁקֶר. The former signifies mischief, *molestia*, just as πονηρία, that which causes πόνον; the latter signifies falsehood, viz. self-deception, illusion, disappointment, inasmuch as the mischief that was prepared for others returns, as is said in *v.* 17, as a grievous and oppressive burden upon the sinner himself; cf. Isa. lix. 4, where אָוֶן, used instead of שֶׁקֶר, characterises the accursed wages of sin, which consists in the unmasking of its vileness, in the disclosure of its self-deception. In *v.* 16 another turn is given to the same thought: he digs a pit for himself (lvii. 7; Eccles. x. 8). *V.* 16 *a* makes mention of the preceding digging of the pit (כָּרָה, to excavate, to hollow out in a circular form, the word especially suitable for the forming of a cistern, בּוֹר, just as חפר is suitable for the forming of a well, באר), 16 *b*, the subsequent falling into it: the aorist וַיִּפֹּל being like that, *e.g.*, in 13 *b*, xvi. 9, xxix. 10. The attributive יִפְעָל is virtually a genitive to שַׁחַת and is rightly taken by Gesenius (§ 123, 3 *a*) as a present: whilst he is in the act of accomplishing

the destruction that he has prepared for others, it becomes his own. The mischief, עָמָל, prepared for others, returns upon his own head (בְּרֹאשׁוֹ, cleaving to it, just as עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ means settling down upon it and weighing down upon it) and the violence, חָמָס, done by him to others, being turned back by the Judge above (Mic. i. 12), descends upon his own pate (קָדְקֳדוֹ, with *ŏ* by *k*, as *e.g.* in Gen. ii. 23); cf. with Riehm the figures for this in Prov. xxvi. 27 and Sir. xxvii. 25: "he who throws a stone into the air, throws it upon his own head." Thus the righteousness of God is revealed in wrath against the oppressor and in grace towards him who is innocently menaced. Then will the rescued one, then will David thank Jahve, as is due to Him according to the revelation of His righteousness; he will laud the name of Jahve, the Most High (עֶלְיוֹן as an epithet of God is always without the article; *e.g.* lvii. 3). By revealing Himself He has made Himself a name. He has, however, revealed Himself as an omnipotent Judge and Redeemer, as the covenant God who overrules everything that takes place here below. This name, which He has made for Himself by His deeds, David then re-echoes to Him in the last words of his hymn. He who acknowledges (הוֹדָה) his indebtedness to God publishes abroad what is in him. Thanks and praise are a reflection of the good and glorious things that one has experienced.

PSALM VIII.

ENCOMIUM OF THE GLORY THAT IS REFLECTED UPON THE CREATOR OF THE STARRY HEAVENS BY PUNY MAN.

2 Jahve, our Lord,
How glorious is Thy name in all the earth,
Who hast clothed the heavens with Thy glory!
3 Out of the mouth of children and sucklings hast Thou founded a power
Because of Thine adversaries,
To still the enemy and the revengeful.

4 When I behold Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which Thou hast established;
5 What is mortal man, that Thou art mindful of him,
And the son of man, that Thou dost interest Thyself in him!
6 And hast made him little less than divine
And with glory and honour hast crowned him.

7 Thou madest him ruler over the works of Thy hands,
All things hast Thou put under his feet:
8 Sheep and oxen, all of them,
And also the beasts of the field,
9 The fowl of the heaven, and the fish of the sea,
Whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas.

10 Jahve, our Lord,
How glorious is Thy name in all the earth!

Ps. vi. and vii. closed with a similar anticipation of an undeceiving of his enemies by means of a penal judgment; the latter is the specialising counterpart of the former, illustrating it, as it were, by means of an example. If at the same time we remember that Ps. vi., if not a morning hymn, still looks back upon sleepless nights spent in weeping, the principle of the arrangement is manifest, now that a hymn of the night follows Ps. vi. with vii., its counterpart. David composes also by night; the singing of songs to Jahve was, as a Korahite poet says of himself (xlii. 9), his companionship even in the loneliness of the night. The omission of any reference to the sun in *v.* 4 shows that Ps. viii. is one of those hymns that were composed during the night, or that at least when penning it the author had transferred himself in thought to that season. The poet has the starry heavens before him; he begins with the glorious revelation of Jahve's power on earth and in heaven, and then pauses at man, comparatively puny man, to whom Jahve condescends in love, and whom He has made lord over the work of His hands. This Psalm is, like Ps. civ. and others, a lyric echo of the Mosaic account of the creation. Ewald calls it a flash of

lightning cast into the darkness of the creation. With the exception of the name for children, עוללים, and the verb יָסַד, every poetical expression that occurs in it has its parallel in the poetical passages and in the lofty prose of the Pentateuch. The coincidences with Deut. xxxii. (אנוש, בהמות used of wild animals, יְדִידִי, כּוֹנֵן) are specially striking. On the whole, however, the Psalm is, as Perowne (1873) calls it, a lyric echo of that which the account of the creation penned by the Elohist says, viz. that man bears the image of God, and being called to be the lord of the creatures is as it were a god upon earth. By ותחסרהו וגו׳ the poet means the *imago divina*, by תמשילהו, its outcome, the *dominium terræ*.

Even Hitzig acknowledges the Davidic authorship, while Hupfeld is silent, and Olshausen says that nothing can be asserted on the subject. The idea that David composed it while still a shepherd lad in the desert of Judah (an idea that is pleasingly worked out by Nachtigal, *Psalmen gesungen vor David's Thronbesteigung*, 1797, in E. G. von Bengel's opinion *cum magna veri specie*), Hitzig, although he at first supported it, has again rightly rejected. We say rightly; for just as the Gospels contain no discourses delivered by our Lord previous to His baptism in the Jordan, and the Canon of the New Testament contains no writings of the Apostles dating from the time before Pentecost, so the Canon of the Old Testament contains no Psalms of David that were composed by him prior to his anointing. Not till after he is the anointed of the God of Jacob does he become the sweet singer of Israel, upon whose tongue is the word of Jahve (2 Sam. xxiii. 1*f.*).

The title runs: *For the Musician upon the Gittith, a Psalm of David.* The Targum renders it: *super cithara, quam David de Gath attulit*, evidently looking upon the *Gittith* as a Philistine cithern, just as (according to Athenæus and Pollux) there was a peculiar Phœnician and Carian flute, called γίγγρας, which was played at the festival of Adonis, and also an

Egyptian and a Phrygian flute, from which, considering the relationship subsisting between Phrygian and Armenian, the elegy (Armen. *elegu*, reed) seems to derive its name.[1] The purport of all the Psalms with עַל־הַגִּתִּית as part of their title (viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv.) is laudatory; the Gittith was, therefore, an instrument with a joyous sound, or (and this explanation accounts better for the fact that it occurs only in Psalm-titles) a joyous melody, perhaps a march of the Gittite guard, 2 Sam. xv. 18 (Hitz.).

Kurtz, taking *v.* 2 *ab* as well as *v.* 10 by themselves as an introit and a finale, and attaching 2 *c* (Thou whose majesty . . .) to the first strophe, brings out four tetrastichic strophes; but אֲשֶׁר is not very well adapted for beginning a strophe; were the case as Kurz supposes, the poet would in our opinion have written אתה אשר תנה הודך. The Syriac counts 18 *pethgâme*.

Vers. 2, 3. Here, for the first time, the subject speaking in the Psalm is not an individual, but a number of persons; and who else but the community of Israel, which (as in Neh. x. 30) can call Jahve its Lord (אֲדֹנֵינוּ, like אֲדֹנִי, from אֲדֹנִים, *plur. excellentiæ*, Ges., § 108, 2), but is also aware at the same time that what by grace it has become it is called to become for the whole earth. The name of God (שֵׁם = שְׁמוֹ, שְׁמִי, from שָׁמָה, to be high, prominent, recognizable) is the manifestation of His nature that comes out in the works of creation, and in the deeds of redemption, by means of which manifestation His nature makes itself knowable and nameable by us.[2] *This*

[1] *Vid.*, however, Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 545 ff., where ἔλεγος is traced back to the same root as ἐλελίζειν and λιγύς, λιγυρός.

[2] The Kuphish philologists derived *ism* (*sim* or even *sum*) from وسم, to mark, designate (=*wism*), the Baṣrensian, on the other hand (*vid.* Beiḍâwi's *Koran-Komm.*, p. 3 *f.* of Fleischer's ed.) from سما. The latter derivation is favoured not only by the plural أَسْمَاء and the dialectical singular سُمَى, but also by the circumstance, that in the inflectional forms of the word and in its derivatives there nowhere occurs an initial

name of God, it is true, is not yet everywhere so known and extolled as the community, to which positive revelation has interpreted it, can know and extol it; but nevertheless the divine name that has been uttered in creation and its works, by means of which God has revealed Himself and made Himself knowable and capable of being named, is אַדִּיר, glorious, or (and this answers better to the primary meaning of the word: אדר, הדר, Isa. lxiii. 1, *tumidum, amplum esse*) splendid, throughout the whole earth, even although it should nowhere find an echo.[1]

The clause with אֲשֶׁר תְּנָה וגו׳[2] is not to be rendered: "O that Thou wouldest set Thy glory upon the heavens" (Gesenius even: *quam tuam magnificentiam pone in cœlis*); such a use of the *imper.* after אֲשֶׁר is unheard of, for neither Tit. i. 13 nor Eccles. vi. 12, to which von Hofmann refers, is at all similar: in the latter an interrogative clause is connected with what goes before it in the usual manner, in the former an exhortation by means of "for, because," *i.e.* by means of a relative conjunction, whereas in our passage אֲשֶׁר must be a relative pronoun. Moreover, although it is true that the thought we thus obtain is quite admissible in connection with the history of redemption (lvii. 6, 12), it is clean contrary to

Waw; although, exactly in the same manner as in the case of *ibn* (from בנא) and *ab* (from a verb ابى = ابا, *vid.* my Commentary on Job, p. 380), a final *Waw* makes its appearance, *e.g.* سَمَوِىّ *nominalis* besides سَمَاوِىّ *cœlestis, cæruleus.* The kindred nouns سيماء, a sign, and the like go back upon the middle-vowel stem سام, *f. o., ponere, imponere* (of which وسم is a secondary form). Cf. سُومَة with the Talmudic שׁוּמָא, value, price.

[1] In the first Sidonian inscription אַדִּיר occurs as an epithet of the heavens (שׁמם אדרם).

[2] The vocalisation תְּנָה is traditional; so read, Ps. viii. 2 is interwoven with the beautiful Haggada referring to the giving of the law *Schabbath*, 88 *b* 89 *a*.

the fundamental tone and the situation of this Psalm. For the fundamental thought of the Psalm is this, that the God, *whose glory the heavens reflect*, has also glorified Himself in the earth and in man; and the situation of the poet is such that he has the moon and the stars before his sight: how then could he wish the glorifying of the heavens, whose glory is sparkling in his eyes! To take תִּנָּה, with Ammon and others, last of all Böhl, as a contraction of נָתְנָה, just as in 2 Sam. xxii. 41 תִּתָּה = נָתַתָּה, or with Thenius (*Stud. u. Kritik.*, 1860, p. 712*f.*) directly to read it so, is equally inadmissible; for although the thought: "which (the earth) gives (proclaims) Thy glory over the heavens" is not contrary to the context, and נָתַן עֹז (lxviii. 34) and נָתַן כָּבוֹד (Jer. xiii. 16) may be compared with this נָתַן הוֹד, yet the phrase נָתַן הוֹד עַל means nothing else than to lay majesty upon any one, to clothe him therewith (Num. xxvii. 20; 1 Chron. xxix. 25; Dan. xi. 21; cf. Ps. xxi. 6); and it is this very thought, that the name of the God, who has set His glory upon the heavens (cf. Il. 18, 485: all the signs, *τείρεα*, with which heaven is wreathed, *ἐστεφάνωται*), is also glorious upon earth (cf. cxlviii. 13 with cxiii. 4), which one looks for here. Is now תִּנָּה, although it is always an *imper.* elsewhere, to be taken as an *infin.*, in the same way as רְדָה occurs once (Gen. xlvi. 3) as an *infin.* (like the Arab. *rĭda*, to give to drink, *lĭda* = Hebr. לָדָה, to bring forth)? In that case תִּנָּה הוֹדְךָ would mean the setting of Thy glory (literally *τὸ τιθέναι τὴν δόξαν σου*), just as דֵּעָה אֶת־יְהוָה means the knowledge of Jahve, and שִׂים קִנְּךָ (Obad. *v.* 4) perhaps means the setting of thy nest (Ges., § 133, 1), and we should have to interpret it: O Thou whose laying of Thy glory (whose laying of glory) is upon the heavens, *i.e.* Thou who hast chosen the heavens as the place upon which Thou hast laid Thy glory (Hengst.). So taking it, Jerome renders: *qui posuisti gloriam tuam super cœlos.* So also the Syriac with the Targum: *d*ejabt* (דיהבת) *šubhåch ʿal s*emajå*, and Symm.: *ὃς ἔταξας τὸν ἔπαινόν σου ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν.* This

use of the *nomen verbale* and the genitival relation of אֲשֶׁר to תְּנָה הוֹדְךָ, which are taken as being but one term, are still singular. Hitzig may be right in remarking that no rational man would think and write so; only he thereby condemns his own conjecture, תֵּן הֲהוֹדְךָ (whose extending of glory above the heavens), with its meaningless article and its badly formed תֵּן, which is the name of an animal. Every difficulty would vanish most easily, if it were allowable to vocalise תָּנָה and translate: Thou whose glory extends above the heavens (Riehm); but here again there is still the embarrassing circumstance, that for תָּנָה in this signification, τείνειν (τείνεσθαι), no evidence can be adduced.[1] The verb belongs to the north of Palestine. In Hos. viii. 10, it certainly seems to start from that signification, and to mean "to advance, to spend." The Aram. תְּנָא (cf. תִּנָּה, Jud. v. 11, xi. 40) signifies to repeat, narrate, proclaim, in accordance with which meaning of the word, König (*Lehrgeb.*, p. 304), reading תָּנָה, renders: "because they narrate, tell"; the interpretation of Kurtz and Paulus, who vocalise it תְּנָה, is better: Thou whose glory is praised above the heavens, for which may be adduced the ἐπήρθη ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν of the LXX., which may mean *elata est* (*effertur*) *laudibus*. The thought would be much the same as in xix. 2, or even in Neh. ix. 6; both ideas, that of the silent proclamation of the heavens and that of the loud confession of the heavenly beings, suit the context; but עַל is vague and strange. The change of תָּנָה into נָתַתָּ (Hupf.) helps us to get rid of all difficulties more thoroughly; תנה has the appearance of being a corruption of נתתה. As we have seen, the Syr., Targ., Symm. and Jer. translate as if they had had נתת before them.

In *v.* 3 there now follows the proof of the statement contained in *v.* 2*a*: even everywhere throughout the whole

[1] The Assyr. *tanattum* (=*tanadtum*), *tanittum* (=*tanidtum*) means height, and goes back, not upon תנה, but upon נאד, to swell, to raise one's self, to be lofty.

earth, notwithstanding its distance from the heavens above, Jahve's name is glorious; for children and even sucklings glorify Him there, and that too not mutely and passively by the mere fact of their existence, but with their mouth. עוֹלֵל (= מְעוֹלֵל), or עוֹלָל, from עוֹלַל (*Po.* of עָלַל *ludere*), is the child that is already somewhat mature, that can move about of its own accord and delights in play (Jer. vi. 10, ix. 20);[1] according to 1 Sam. xxii. 19, xv. 3, it is different from יוֹנֵק, which means suckling, not however *infans*, but, since Hebrew mothers were wont to suckle their children for a very long period, a little child that can already prattle and speak (*vid.* 2 Macc. vii. 27). Out of the mouth of such beings Jahve has founded for Himself עֹז. The LXX. renders this: *αἶνον*, praise; and undoubtedly עֹז does sometimes mean power ascribed to God in praise, and therefore a laudatory acknowledgment of His power, but only with verbs of giving (xxix. 1, lxviii. 35, xcvi. 7). Standing alone it cannot have this meaning: here it is supreme authority or victorious might, which God procures for Himself out of the mouth of

[1] According to this derivation, עולל (cf. the Bedouin عألول, *'âlûl*, a young ox) is related to תַּעֲלוּל, whereas עוּל as a synonym of יוֹנֵק signifies one who is supported, nourished (just as *alumnus* = *τρεφόμενος*); for according to the Arab. عال, *fut. o*, the primary meaning of עוּל is "to weigh heavy, to lie upon; to have incumbent upon one's self, to bear, to support, to maintain," whence عَيِّل, *plur.* أَعْيَال, the maintained child of the house (the Arab. word that is mentioned in *Gen. Rabba*, c. 36 and freq., in the sense of ינוקא) and عَيِّلَة (in Damascus, عَيْلَة, *plur.* عَيْلَات), the family that it is incumbent upon the *pater familias* to support. Neither عال, *fut. o*, nor غال, *fut. i*, applied to a pregnant woman who still gives suck, has the direct signification, to suckle; nor does the demon *Ghul* receive his name from swallowing up or sucking out (Ges.), but from falling upon people with destructive intent (غال, *fut. o*).

children that confess Him. As Luther has already remarked upon this passage, this offensive and defensive power is conceived of as a strong building (עֹז in the sense of מָעוֹז ; cf. Jer. xvi. 19 ; Prov. xxi. 22), *i.e.* a fortress, retreat, bulwark, rampart, for the foundation of which He has taken the mouth, *i.e.* the lisping of children, and that too because of those who actively oppose Him, in order to restrain (הַשְׁבִּית, to cause anything to settle, lie down, rest, to silence it, *e.g.* Isa. xvi. 10 ; Ezek. vii. 24) such as cherish principles of hatred against Him and His, and are inspired by a thirst for vengeance which finds utterance in curses. The same combination is found in xliv. 17. It is the fierce, slanderous opponents of revelation that are meant. Jahve has set over against these the mouth of children as a battle array that is able to repel the attack. That which is foolish and weak in the estimation of the world He has chosen, in order to put to shame the wise and that which is strong (1 Cor. i. 27). It is base and naturally weak instruments, by means of which He glorifies His name here below, and overcomes whatever is opposed to this glorifying.

Vers. 4–6. Stier's rendering of the opening words of this strophe is erroneous : for I shall behold. The principal thought that the psalmist has in view is that of *v.* 5 (parallel to 2 *a*, 3) ; *v.* 4 is therefore the protasis (parallel to 2 *b*), and כִּי accordingly = *quum*, *quando* in the sense of *quoties :* as often as he gazes at the heavens, the work of God's fingers, *i.e.* formed directly by Him with the art of creative wisdom and bearing upon themselves His name in luminous characters (wherefore he says שָׁמֶיךָ), the heavens with their boundless spaces (an idea which is implied in the *plur.* שָׁמַיִם), the moon (יָרֵחַ, Amharic *warch*, from יָרַח = אָרַח, ירח, to wander), and, beyond it, the innumerable stars (כּוֹכָבִים = כַּבְכָּבִים, from כָּבַב, كب, to form into a ball : the round ball-shaped, spherical bodies) that are lost in infinite space, and

to which Jahve has assigned (כּוּן, to place and set up in the sense of bringing into existence and giving duration) their fixed place in the firmament—each time he does so, he is overpowered by the thought: what is mortal man . . . ? The most natural thought would have been: compared with these how absolutely nothing is frail, puny man; but this thought is passed over, in order, with grateful emotion and astonished adoration, to celebrate the divine love which appears in so much the more glorious a light, the divine love which condescends to the poor dust of the earth. אֱנוֹשׁ, from אֲנַשׁ = נוּשׁ, to be fragile (different from אֲנַשׁ = انس, *assuescere*),[1] characterises man from the point of view of his weakness, frailty, mortality (cf. ciii. 15; Isa. li. 12; *vid.* on Gen. iv. 26). Nor is בֶּן־אָדָם without a similar secondary reference: it reminds us of man's origin from the earth (אֲדָמָה) and of the sin-stained beginning of his history. Referring, as it does, backwards to עוֹלֵלִים וְיוֹנְקִים, it is equivalent to יְלוּד אִשָּׁה in Job xiv. 1: man, not as directly created by God, but as brought into existence by means of human instrumentality, man born of woman. As follows from both these designations, it is man as he now is that is spoken of. Man, as we have him before us in ourselves and in others, this weak and dependent being, is by no means forgotten by God, God remembers him and looks after him (פָּקַד, √פק, to look

[1] Now that Assyrian has taken its place among the dialects that must be consulted upon etymological questions, אִישׁ (plur. אֲנָשִׁים) can no longer be regarded as a softening of *inš*; the root is אוּשׁ, to be strong, (whence יוּאָשׁ, הִתְאַשֵּׁשׁ). On the other hand, the name for woman is contracted from *inša*; the שׁ, however, as the Arab. إِنسِيّ shows, is not the same as the שׁ of אִישׁ. The name for woman means the weak (the tender), from אֲנַשׁ, Assyr. *anâšu*, to be weak. Whether a third verbal stem (Arab. أَنِسَ, to be social) is required for إِنسان, אֱנוֹשׁ, אֲנָשִׁים (נָשִׁים), etc., further investigation will show. In his excursus on lxix. 21, Wetzstein developes peculiar views on this family of words.

after anything with wide-opened eyes, used of examining heedfully, especially of visiting, and with the accusative usually of visiting with a loving superintendence, *e.g.* Jer. xv. 15); He does not leave him to himself, but enters into personal intercourse with him; he is the special object towards which His gracious eye is directed (cf. cxliv. 3, and the parody of the tempted one in Job vii. 17 *f.*).

It is in *v.* 6 that the psalmist first glances back at the work of creation. וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ (different from the *impf. consec.* of Job vii. 18) describes that which happened formerly. חִסַּר מִן signifies to cause one to be deficient in something, so that it is wanting to him (Eccles.i v. 8). מִן is neither comparative (*paullo inferiorem eum fecisti Deo*) nor partitive (*paullum derogasti ei divinæ naturæ*), but, seeing that אלהים is never used in an abstract manner so as to be equivalent to divine essentiality, negative (*paullum derogasti ei ne esset Deus*), so that מאלהים is equivalent to מִהְיוֹת אלהים; cf. מִמֶּלֶךְ in 1 Sam. xv. 23, מִשָּׁם in Isa. vii. 8 (Riehm). The LXX., Syr., and Targ. translate: ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, for which the other Greek versions have παρὰ θεόν. According to Gen. i. 27, man was created בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים; he is a being in the image of God and therefore almost a divine being. In *v.* 26, however, when God says: "let us make man in our image, after our likeness," He associates Himself with the angels; and therefore the translation of the LXX., with which the Targum also agrees, is not unwarranted. Seeing that in the biblical way of looking at this matter, the angels, as being the nearest creaturely effulgence of God's substance, are so closely associated with Him, it is really possible that when David wrote מֵאֱלֹהִים he thought not only of God but also of the angels. Since man is in the image of God, he is also in the image of the angels; being only a little less than divine, he is only a little less than angelic. The somewhat superangelic position, which man assumes in virtue of the fact that, inasmuch as spirit and matter are united in him, he is

the bond of all created things, is here left out of account. The author has only this one thing in his mind, that compared with God, who is רוּחַ, and with the angels, who are not בני אדם, but בני אלהים, man is inferior in this respect, that he is a material being, and for that very reason also a limited mortal being, as Theodoret briefly and well remarks: *τῷ θνητῷ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἠλάττωται.* This is the מְעַט, wherein is concentrated everything that is wanting to his being a divine being. But it is merely מְעַט. The statement in *v.* 6*a* refers to the element of man's nature that is in the image of God, and especially to the spirit from God that was breathed into him; 6*b* refers to his godlike position as a ruler, which is in keeping with this his participation in the divine nature: *honore ac decore coronasti eum.* כָּבוֹד (√כב, to form into a ball, whence כבר, to be massive, heavy, important) is the manifestation of glory looked at from the point of view of its weightiness and fulness (cf. جَلَّ, to be highly respectable, majestic, literally, according to the primary meaning, to be voluminous), הוֹד (cf. הֵד, הֵידַד), from the point of view of its far resounding announcement of itself (*vid.* on Job xxxix. 20), הָדָר, from the point of view of its brilliancy, majesty and beauty; הוֹד וְהָדָר (xcvi. 6), or even הֲדַר כְּבוֹד הוֹד ה׳ (cxlv. 5), is the designation of the divine doxa, with the image of which man is adorned as with a kingly crown. The preceding *impf. consec.* stamps תְּעַטְּרֵהוּ and תַּמְשִׁילֵהוּ also as historical retrospects. The following strophe unfolds the kingly glory of man: he is the lord of all things, the lord of all creatures upon earth.

Vers. 7–9. Man is a king, and not a king without a domain; the world around, with the works of creative wisdom which fill it, is his kingdom. The words, "put under his feet," sound like a paraphrase of the רְדָה of Gen. i. 26, 28. כֹּל is unlimited (as in Job xiii. 1, xlii. 2; Isa. xliv. 24); the development of it, however, in *vv.* 8 and 9 is confined to the earth, and even there is exemplified only in the animal world of the land, the air and the water. With noble pride the

poet surveys this royal domain of man. His language is accordingly highly poetical. The enumeration begins with the domestic animals, and passes on from them to the wild beasts—all the animals of the dry land. צֹאנָה (צֹנֶא, Num. xxxii. 24), from צָנָה (צָאָן), ضنى (ضأن), for which also ضان, *fut. o.*, (*proliferum esse*) is used, is a poetical word, equivalent to צֹאן, the usual name for small cattle. אֲלָפִים (a prose word in Aramaic, as the name of the letter shows) is here, as in Deut vii. 13, xxviii. 4, 18, 51, equivalent to בָּקָר; it comes from אָלַף, to yield to, and is applied to the oxen, which willingly accommodate themselves to the service of man, especially the husbandman. The wild animal, which is called חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ (הַשָּׂדֶה) in prose, as being the most vivacious animal, here bears the poetical name בְּהֵמוֹת (as in Deut. xxxii. 24) and indeed בַּהֲמוֹת שָׂדָי (as in Joel ii. 22; cf. i. 20; 1 Sam. xvii. 44); שָׂדַי (in pause שָׂדָי) is the archaic and consequently poetical, primitive form of שָׂדֶה (from שָׂדֶה, original form שַׂדוּ, سدا, to go into the open country; cf. السادى, that which runs freely); not being inflected it has come to have a collective meaning. From the land animals the description passes over to those of the air and the water. צִפּוֹר (Arab. عُصْفُور, with ʿAin prefixed, literally the whistler, the twitterer) is the softer word for עוֹף; שָׁמַיִם is without the article, in conformity with poetical usage, whereas הַיָּם receives the article, so as not to be pronounced as but one syllable, and die away too rapidly in sound. In the case of יַמִּים (as in Gen. i. 22) the article might once more be omitted, just as in the case of שָׁמַיִם. עֹבֵר is a collective participle. If what was meant had been: he (or, since he), viz. man, passes through the paths of the seas (Böttcher, Cassel, Grätz, and even Aben-Ezra and Kimchi), the thought would not have been expressed in such a monostichic form and in so misleading a way. The words may be a comprehensive designation of the animal world whose home is in the sea; and it is this that is really meant, from the smallest worm to the

gigántic leviathan: ὁππόσα ποντοπόρους παρεπιστείβουσι κελεύθους (Apolinar.). If man thus has dominion over every living thing around him, the nearest as well as the most remote, and even that which is apparently the most untameable, it is self-evident, that all the inanimate created things in his vicinity must also serve him as their king. The poet looks upon man in the light of the vocation for which he was created.

Ver. 10. He has now demonstrated the assertion which he made in *v.* 2, that the name of Jahve, whose glory the heavens reflect, is also glorious on earth. And so he can conclude by repeating the thought with which he began, only now in a fuller sense, and weave his Psalm as it were into a wreath.

This very Psalm, of which one would have least expected it, is frequently quoted and interpreted in a Messianic sense in the New Testament; yea, our Saviour's designation of Himself by the name, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, so far as it goes back upon the Scriptures of the Old Testament, leans upon this Psalm no less than upon Dan. vii. 13. The use, which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 6–8) makes of *vv.* 5–7 of this Psalm, shows how the Messianic application of it in the New Testament was effected. The psalmist looks upon man as one who glorifies God, and as one whom God has made a prince. He leaves out of account the fact that man has fallen from this position in consequence of his sin. But both ways of looking at man's position are warranted. On the one hand, that which man became in virtue of his creation still appears operative even in his present state; on the other hand it appears distorted and sequestered. If we compare what the Psalm says with this shady side of reality, from which side this reality is incongruent with man's destiny, the hymn which treats of man in the present becomes a prophecy of man in the future. The Psalm undergoes this metamorphosis in the New Testament consciousness, which looks rather at what is lost than at what remains of man's original condition. The central point of

the New Testament consciousness is indeed Jesus, the Restorer of what is lost. The sovereignty of the world which has been lost to fallen humanity, and which remains to it only in a ruinous condition, is allotted to mankind, as redeemed by Him, in full and perfect reality. Redeemed humanity is not yet in the actual possession of this dominion; but in the person of Jesus it is already enthroned at God's right hand. In Him the idea of humanity is realised transcendently, *i.e.* in accordance with a much higher standard than was applied at the foundation of the world. For a little while (*βραχύ τι*) He has entered into the state in which humanity was created, a state but a little (*βραχύ τι*) beneath that of the angels, in order to exalt redeemed humanity above them. Everything (כֹּל) is really as absolutely subjected to Him as it is stated to be in the Psalm: not only the animal world, not only the earth, but the universe with all the forces that are working in it, those that are hostile to God as well as those that are in His service, yea even the power of death (1 Cor. xv. 27; cf. Eph. i. 22). By means of redemption also, the confession uttered by the mouth of children has become, more than heretofore, a bulwark founded by God, in order that the resistance of the opponents of revelation may be brought to nought when dashing against it. We have an example of this in Matt. xxi. 16, where our Lord points the Pharisees and scribes, who were furious and enraged at the Hosannas of the children, to Ps. viii. 3. Before everything else, redemption demands of man, that he become once more a little child; and it reveals its mysteries, which are hidden from the wise and the prudent, unto babes. Thus, therefore, it is *μικροὶ καὶ νήπιοι*, whose tongue the Spirit of God unlooses, in order to put the unbeliever to shame; and everything that the Psalm says of man in the present becomes, when looked at in the light thrown upon the history of redemption by the New Testament, a prophecy of the Son of man *κατ' ἐξοχήν* and of the new humanity.

PSALM IX.

A HYMN TO THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGE AFTER AN OVERTHROW OF HOSTILE PEOPLES.

2 א I will thank Jahve with my whole heart,
א I will tell out all Thy wonders—
3 א I will be glad and exult in Thee,
א I will sing praise to Thy name, O Thou Most High!

4 ב Because mine enemies turn backward,
Stumble and perish at Thine angry look.
5 For Thou hast maintained my right and my cause,
Thou hast sat down in the judgment-seat, a righteous Judge,
6 ג Thou didst rebuke peoples, Thou didst destroy the wicked,
Their name Thou didst wipe out for ever and ever.
7 ד The enemy are come to an end, they are perpetual ruins,
And cities hast Thou uprooted, yea effaced is their very memory.

8 ו But Jahve is enthroned for ever,
He hath set up His throne for judgment.
9 And He shall judge the world in righteousness,
He shall minister judgment to the nations in equity.

10 ו Oh that Jahve may become a stronghold to the oppressed,
A stronghold for times of hopeless trouble,
11 Then shall they that know Thy name trust in Thee,
Because Thou hast not forsaken them that enquire after Thee, Jahve!

12 ז Sing praise unto Jahve, who dwelleth in Zion,
Proclaim His deeds among the peoples,
13 That the avenger of blood hath remembered them,
He hath not forgotten the cry of the afflicted.

14 ח "Have pity upon me, Jahve; behold my affliction from them that hate me,
Thou that liftest me up from the gates of death,
15 That I may tell out all Thy praise,
That in the gates of the daughter of Zion I may exult in Thy salvation."

16 ט The peoples had to sink down into the pit which they
themselves made,
In the net, which they hid, was their own foot caught.
17 Jahve made Himself known: He executed judgment,
Snaring the wicked in the work of his own hands.
(*Stringed Instruments. Selah.*)

18 Yea, back to Hades must the wicked descend,
All the heathen, the forgetful of God.
19 For the poor shall not always be forgotten,
The hope of the afflicted is not perished for ever.

20 ק Arise, Jahve, let not mortal man be defiant,
Let the heathen be judged in Thy presence!
21 Strike them with terror, O Jahve;
Let the heathen know that they are mortal men.
(*Selah.*)

Just as Ps. vii. was connected with Ps. vi., as being an exemplification of it, so Ps. ix. is connected with Ps. viii., as giving an illustration of the glorifying of the divine name upon earth. And how beautiful it is, that the Psalm referring to the glory of Jahve's name upon earth, viz. Ps. viii., is inserted between a Psalm which concludes with, "I will laud the name of Jahve, the Most High" (vii. 18), and one which begins, "I will laud Thy name, Oh Most High!" (ix. 3).

The LXX. translates the עַל־מוּת לַבֵּן of the title: *ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ* (Vulg. *pro occultis filii*), as if it were עַל־עֲלֻמוֹת; Aq. and Sexta as well as Theod. and Quinta read עלמות (just as it occurs in MSS. and in old editions) as one word, and give it, like Luther, the meaning "youth." The rendering of Symm., Targ., and Jer.: *pro morte filii*, corresponds better with the traditional text. The Targum understands by the בֵּן the duellist Goliath (= אִישׁ הַבְּנַיִם), and a few Rabbis even look upon לבן as a transposition of נבל, and translate the title thus: upon the death of Nabal. This view has been revived by Hengstenberg, who looks upon נבל as a general designation of all Nabal-like fools. All these and other conceits originate in the opinion that

these words are an inscription indicative of the purport of the Psalm. They, however, rather indicate the tune or melody to which the Psalm was to be sung, and that by means of the catch-word of the song—perhaps a popular song—with which this melody had become identified. At the end of Ps. xlviii. this indication of the melody runs simply: עַל־מוּת. The view of some Jewish expositors, who make לַבֵּן refer to the musician בֵּן mentioned in 1 Chron. xv. 18, has, therefore, some probability in its favour. But this name is not exempt from critical suspicion. And why should not a popular song have begun with מוּת לַבֵּן, "death to the son . . ." (cf. Jer. xxvi. 11), or (if we give up the present punctuation) מָוֶת לַבֵּן, "death makes white"?

Even Hitzig does not allow himself to be misled as to their old Davidic origin by the fact that Pss. ix. and x. are arranged alphabetically; these two have the honour of belonging to the fourteen Psalms that are acknowledged by him to be genuinely Davidic (Pss. iii.–xix., with the exception of v., vi., xiv.). In the case of other Psalms, therefore, the alphabetical arrangement cannot by itself bring us down to "the times of poetical trifling, and of depraved taste." But neither may the freedom, with which the alphabetical arrangement is handled in Pss. ix. and x., be regarded as an indication of an earlier antiquity than these times; for elsewhere also the Old Testament poets do not allow themselves to be bound by such forms (*vid.* on cxlv.; cf. on xlii. 6); and the fact that the alphabetical arrangement is not carried out in Pss. ix. and x. has its ground in something else than the license, which David, as distinguished from later poets, permits to himself. In reality this couple of Psalms shows that even David composed acrostically. And why not? Even among the Romans, as Wölfflin (*Münchener Sitzungsberichte*, 1881) has shown, it was in archaic Latinity that alliteration flourished most; Ennius already composed acrostically (Cicero, *De Divin.*, ii.

54, § 111), and he does not belong to the leaden, but to the iron age, out of which the golden age developed; and the earliest German heroic songs are clothed in the garb of alliteration, which is called by Vilmar the most characteristic and sublime form that the poetic spirit of that people has created. The alphabetical form is also popular, as is evident from Augustine's *Retract.*, i. 20. It is not a trifling substitute for the vanished spirit of poetry, nor merely an aid to the eye, an outward adornment—it is full of meaning in itself. The didactic poet looks upon the series of the elements of language as the flight of steps, up which he leads his pupil to the sanctuary of wisdom, or as the many-celled casket in which he puts the pearls of the teaching of his wisdom; the lyric poet looks upon them as the key-board, on which he strikes every key, in order to give the fullest expression to his emotions; even the prophet does not disdain, as is evident from Nah. i. 3–7, to allow the sequence of the letters of the alphabet to have an influence upon the arrangement of his thoughts.[1] When, therefore, of the eight or nine alphabetical Psalms (ix., x., xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxi., cxii., cxix., cxlv.), five bear the title לדוד (ix.–x., xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxlv.), we shall not hold them to be non-Davidic, simply because they exhibit an alphabetical plan which is more or less fully carried out.

Seeing that Ps. ix. is not in any way wanting in internal finish, this is not yet the place in which to speak of the relation in which Ps. x., which is anonymous, stands to it. It is hymnic from beginning to end. The idea that in *v.* 14 it passes over from thanksgiving into supplication rests, as we shall see, upon a misconception. It is a thoroughly national and triumphant hymn of thanksgiving, composed by David at the time when Jahve was already enthroned upon Zion, and is, therefore, to be dated from the time after

[1] This observation belongs to Pastor Frohnmeyer of Wurtemberg.

the ark was brought to Jerusalem. It is impossible, however, to determine the situation more particularly. We know too little regarding the Davidic wars and victories registered in 2 Sam. viii. Among the silver and gold which David had gained as booty, and which he dedicates to the sanctuary of Jahve, there is also found some which he had taken from Amalek (2 Sam. viii. 12; 1 Chron. xviii. 11), which he utterly routed twice during his stay among the Philistines, before he became king of the whole of Israel (1 Sam. xxvii. 8*f.*, xxx.). The Psalm is possibly a retrospect of the wars with Amalek, Philistia, and other foes, so that the expressions referring to their extermination in 6*b* and 7*b* may be regarded as echoes of Ex. xvii. 14–16 (cf. Deut. xxv. 17–19). In the Syriac (Cod. Ambros.) the title runs: by David, when he had slain Hadarezer, king of Zoba.

Vers. 2, 3. In this, the first and normative strophe of the Psalm, which is laid out in tetrastichs, the alphabetical form is carried out in the most stringent manner possible: it consists of four lines, each of which begins with א, and forms the prelude of the hymn. The singer stirs himself up to praise Jahve in joyful strains. With his whole heart (cxxxviii. 1), *i.e.* with the participation of all the powers of mind and soul that are concentrated in his heart, he will bring to God his thankful acknowledgment and confession, and declare His wondrous deeds (xxvi. 7), which transcend all human desire and comprehension; he will rejoice and exult in Jahve as the ground of his rejoicing and as the sphere of his joy; and with mouth and harp he will laud the name of the Most High, the letters of which are the glorious deeds he has just experienced. עֶלְיוֹן is not an attributive of the name (Hitz.: to Thine exalted name), but, as it always is since Gen. xiv. 18–22 (*e.g.* xcvii. 9), an epithet of God. As an attributive of שִׁמְךָ, we should expect הָעֶלְיוֹן.

Vers. 4, 5. His summons to himself to render thanks is still resounding, and the ב-strophe continues it by assigning

its ground. Here the *prep.* בְּ indicates at once the time and the reason (as in lxxvi. 10; 2 Chron. xxviii. 6), like the Latin *recedentibus hostibus meis retro*. As in lvi. 10 (cf. xliv. 11), אָחוֹר serves to intensify the notion of being beaten back, just as in Latin, verbs with *re* are strengthened by *retro*. In 4 *b* the place of the *infin. constr.* is taken by finite verbs; here these are *impff.*, to be taken in the sense of presents, just as in 2 Chron. xvi. 7 we find a preterite which is to be taken as a perfect. For Hitzig's translation: when mine enemies retreat backwards, they stumble . . ., is opposed both by the circumstance that there is no syntactical indication in 4 *b* that it is an apodosis (cf. xxvii. 2), and also by the fact that, while יִכָּשְׁלוּ is certainly fitted to continue the description in שׁוּב אָחוֹר (cf. John xviii. 6), it is flat if taken as a principal clause to the adverbial clause בְּשׁוּב אויבי אחור; and moreover, אחור does not signify backwards (which is rather אַחֲרַנִּית), but back. The מִן of מִפָּנֶיךָ is the מִן of the cause, whence the effect proceeds. What is meant is God's angry countenance, the look of which sets His enemies on fire as if they were fuel (xxi. 10), in contradistinction to His loving countenance which sends forth light. Even now while this is happening, and because it happens, he will praise God. We see from *v.* 4 that the Psalm was composed immediately after the victory, and while the vanquished were still reaping its disastrous consequences. David sees in this a judicial act of Jahve's. To execute one's judgment, מִשְׁפָּט (Mic. vii. 9), to maintain one's suit or claim, דִּין (cxl. 13), is equivalent to: to assist him and his just cause in obtaining their right. Without suffixes these phrases are used also in the sense of judging punitively; but the objective genitive after these substantives never denotes the person against whom, but always the person in whose behalf, the judge intervenes. Jahve has seated Himself upon His judgment seat as a judge of righteousness (as in Jer. xi. 20; cf. on Prov. viii. 16), *i.e.* as a judge whose judicial procedure is righteousness, and has

given His decision in his favour. In לְ יָשַׁב (as in cxxxii. 11), which is so far different from עַל יָשַׁב (xlvii. 9), the idea of motion, *considĕre*, is prominent.

Vers. 6, 7. The strophe with ג, which is perhaps intended to represent also ד and ה, assigns further reasons for his thanksgiving, in addition to those mentioned in *v.* 4. The judicial act of God, which he has thus just experienced, is not celebrated as an isolated event, but in connection with many others, and indeed as the sum, so to speak, of many others, which preceded it. This being the case, we may in *v.* 6 think not only of the Ammonites, but also (with Hengst.) of the Amalekites (2 Sam. viii. 12), who had been threatened with the "blotting out of their remembrance" ever since the time of Moses (Ex. xvii. 14; Deut. xxv. 19; cf. Num. xxiv. 20). גָּעַר is an onomatopoetic word; it means, "to cry out to" (Ethiop. *gaʿára*, *geʿra*), and in a more general sense, "to cry," and more especially "to lament, complain." The Divine threatening is the word of omnipotence that destroys, in contradistinction to the omnipotent word that creates. רָשָׁע along with גּוֹיִם is individualising; cf. *v.* 18 with *vv.* 16, 17. The pausal וְעָד instead of וָעֶד, possibly in order to avoid the triple *a* sound in לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד (Nägelsbach, § 8 *extr.*), is similar to יְרֻחָף for יְרַחֵף in Deut. xxxii. 11.[1] In *v.* 7, הָאוֹיֵב (with *Azla legarmeh*) is apparently a vocative. In that case, נָתַשְׁתָּ must also have been addressed to the enemy. But if we interpret it: "thou hast destroyed thine own cities, their memorial has perished," destroyed, viz. at Israel's challenge, the thought is farfetched; and if we interpret it: "the cities which thou hast destroyed, the memorial of them has perished," *i.e.* men no longer think of thy deeds of conquest, the thought is expressed very obscurely and cannot be

[1] In the Babylonian system of punctuation ועד (לעולם) has *Pathach magnum* (וָעֶד), not small *Pathach*, *i.e.* *segol*; in that system the *Pathach* comprehends the still undeveloped *segol*. *Vid.* Pinsker, *Einleitung*, pp. xxi. ff.

supported by any of the numerous parallel passages which speak of blotting out so as to leave no trace behind. Moreover, according to neither of these interpretations is the strengthening of זִכְרָם by means of הֵמָּה comprehensible; each of them makes the twofold masculine זִכְרָם הֵמָּה refer to עָרִים (which is done thoughtlessly by most expositors), whereas עִיר is feminine except in a very few instances; and consequently זכרם המה must be made to refer to the persons of the enemies (cf. xxxiv. 17, cix. 15), unless this be absolutely impossible. האויב might rather be *nom. abs.*: "the enemy—it is all over with his destructions for ever"; but חָרְבָּה never has an active, but always only a neuter signification; or: "the enemy—ruins are finished for ever"; but when תָּמִים is used along with *ruinæ*, it means to be destroyed rather than to be completed. Moreover, in connection with both these renderings we miss the retrospective pronoun (חָרְבוֹתָיו), an objection that applies also to the reading חֳרָבוֹת (LXX., Vulg., Syr.), which leaves it uncertain whose swords are meant. But why should we not rather directly connect האויב with תַּמּוּ as its subject? In other places also תַּמּוּ is connected with a singular collective subject (*e.g.* Isa. xvi. 4); here it precedes, like הָאֹרֵב in Jud. xx. 37. Besides, חָרְבוֹת לָנֶצַח is a nominative of the product, corresponding to the factitive object with verbs of making: the enemies are destroyed to eternal ruins, *i.e.* so that they have become such; or more in accordance with the accentuation: the enemy, destroyed to ruins are they for ever. To become חרבות or חָרֵב and נֶחֱרַב—these are expressions that are used elsewhere both of nations and of individuals (Jer. xxv. 9; Isa. lx. 12; 2 Kings iii. 23). For what follows also the accentuation contains hints that are worthy of notice. It does not take נָתַשְׁתָּ (with the regular *Pathach* by *Athnach* after *Mercha-mahpach*; *vid.* on ii. 7) as a relative clause, and therefore does not require that זכרם המה be referred back to ערים. Our interpretation is as follows: and cities (viz. the hostile

cities) Thou hast destroyed (נָתַשׁ, *evellere*, *exstirpare*, as in Jer. i. 10; Dan. xi. 4), perished is their (the enemies') memorial. Now also we can understand, why it is that זִכְרָם, according to the rule stated in Ges. § 121, 3, is so remarkably strengthened by the addition of הֵמָּה (cf. Num. xiv. 32; 1 Sam. xx. 42; Prov. xxii. 19, xxiii. 15; Ezek. xxxiv. 11). Hupfeld is of opinion, that the enemies themselves and their cities might possibly be contrasted with one another. But the antithesis follows in *v.* 8: yea, their very memorial has perished, whereas Jahve on the contrary for ever endures and is enthroned as judge. This antithesis also confirms our opinion, that זכרם does not refer to the cities, but to the collective term האויב. With this interpretation of *v.* 7, we neither require to read זִכְרָם מֵהֵמָּה (Targ.) nor זֵכֶר מֵהֵמָּה (Paulus, Hitz., Riehm). The latter reading is strongly recommended by Job xi. 20 (cf. Jer. x. 2); but seeing that זֵכֶר is not meant here subjectively (their own remembrance), but objectively (remembrance of them), it is not quite admissible. To attach המה to the following verse and supply יֹאבְדוּ (after xcii. 10, cii. 27), or, still better, אֻבְדוּ (the dropping out of which was occasioned by the placing of המה at the end of the preceding verse): "those perish, but Jahve is enthroned for ever" (Ley, Dyserinck, Baethgen, Grätz), would afford the most radical assistance. That ערים here, as in cxxxix. 20, means zealots, *i.e.* adversaries (from עִיר, *fervere*, *zelare*), is not to be thought of; for the Psalm has neither an Aramaising nor a North Palestinian character. That the cities that are plucked up by the roots are cities belonging to the enemy, is evident from the context.

Vers. 8, 9. While the enemies are destroyed so that not even a trace or a memorial of them remains, Jahve on the other hand is the One that endureth for ever. This strophe stands in the closest connection with the preceding one, being the antithetical continuation of it, just as the ב-strophe assigned the ground for what was stated in the one preced-

ing it. The verb יֵשֵׁב does not here have the general signification "to remain" (like עָמַד, to endure), but just the same meaning as in xxix. 10. Everything that is opposed to Him comes to a terrible end; He, on the contrary, is enthroned, or (as is implied in the *impf.*) remains enthroned, for ever, and that too as Judge; for the purpose of judgment He hath prepared His throne (כִּסֵּא, Sumeric *guzâ*, Assyr. *kussû*, perhaps not originally a Semitic word). The same God, who has just proved that He lives and reigns, will hold a still more comprehensive, stringent, and impartial judgment of the peoples. תֵּבֵל (יְבֵל, like the proper name תֵּבִן, from יָבִן, Ew., § 161 *a*), a word that is used only in poetry, and always without the article, signifies primarily (as distinguished from אֶרֶץ, the terrestrial globe, and אֲדָמָה, the covering or soil of the earth) the fertile and cultivated surface of the earth, being synonymous with ἡ οἰκουμένη (γῆ). The poet has in view the final judgment, which is announced and guaranteed in all preceding judgments. This Davidic utterance regarding the future is repeated in later Psalms.[1]

Vers. 10, 11. In thus judging the peoples, Jahve, as a second ו-strophe says, shows Himself to be a refuge and support to His own. The voluntative with *Waw consecutive* expresses that which is longed for by the poet for his own sake, and for the sake of the result that is mentioned in *v.* 11. מִשְׂגָּב, a high, steep place, where one is placed beyond the reach of danger, is a figure that was naturally suggested to David by the experiences of his time of persecution. דָּךְ (in pause דָּךְ) is properly the one who finds himself in a bruised condition (from דָּכָא = דָּבַךְ, דָּכָה, to crush, thrust

[1] The *Gaja* in יְשַׁפֵּט־תֵּבֵל (ix. 9, xcvi. 13) stands according to the rule, that monosyllabic words with lengthened syllable, and likewise the lengthened syllable of polysyllabic words, take *Gaja* before *Makkef*, in order to secure to the lengthened syllable its emphatic pronunciation, just as in יְשָׁמְרֵ֣־צאתך (cxxi. 8), it secures יְשָׁ֣, which is at a distance from the tone-syllable, against being slurred over.

down, a primary signification which in دكّ, دكن, passes over into the notion of that which is depressed = flat, and in דַּק, into that of the thin and fine), and therefore the one who is pressed down to the very uttermost, even to being crushed. לְעִתּוֹת בַּצָּרָה, with datival לְ (as probably also in x. 1), is parallel to לַדָּךְ. עִתּוֹת, from עֵת (time, and then continuance, lxxxi. 16, as well as condition) signifies the public circumstances of the time, or even the concerns of private life (xxxi. 16); and בַּצָּרָה is not הַצָּרָה with בְּ (Böttch.), an expression that would be needlessly circumstantial ("for times in need"), but one word, formed from בָּצַר (to cut off, Arab. to see, properly to distinguish precisely), just as בַּקָּשָׁה is formed from בִּקֵּשׁ. Properly it means a cutting off, or a being cut off, *i.e.* either closure, barrier, especially drought (= בַּצֹּרֶת, Jer. xvii. 8, *plur.* בְּצָרוֹת, Jer. xiv. 1), or distress, dilemma, in which the prospect of deliverance is cut off. Dunasch already had the right view: לשון יחיד מן דברי בצרות, *i.e.* it is the singular of בצרות in Jer. xiv. 1. Since God is a final refuge for such hopeless conditions of life, *i.e.* for those who find themselves in such hopeless circumstances, the trust of His own is confirmed, revived, renewed. To them that know His name, He has now disclosed its purport by His deeds and in a perfect manner; and they that inquire after Him, or trouble and concern themselves about Him (the meaning of דָּרַשׁ as distinguished from בִּקֵּשׁ), have now experienced that He too does not forget them, but full of might and grace acknowledges them as His own.

Vers. 12, 13. Accordingly the ז-strophe with its זַמְּרוּ and הַגִּידוּ calls upon men to praise such a God,—a God who has done and will do such things. The summons contains an ethical demand, and is therefore addressed to all and sundry. Jahve, He who is everywhere to be praised, is called יֹשֵׁב צִיּוֹן, which does not mean: He who is enthroned on Zion, but He who inhabiteth Zion (Ges., § 138, 1). This is the name given to Him ever since His earthly throne, the ark of the cove-

nant, was placed upon the castle hill of Jerusalem (lxxvi. 3); it is the epithet applied to Him during the period of the prefigurative kingship of promise. That Jahve's salvation shall be made known from Zion to the whole world, even to the non-Israelite world, in order to its redemption, is, as we see here and elsewhere, an idea already pulsating in the Davidic Psalms; later prophecy sees in greater combinations of events in the future the manner in which this idea is one day to be realised. That which is to be proclaimed to the peoples is called עֲלִילוֹתָיו, since Hannah's hymn (1 Sam. ii. 3) the designation given in Psalms and prophets to the *magnalia Dei* (from עָלַל ✓על, to come over or upon anything, to influence a person or thing as it were from above, to subject them to one's activity, to affect them). With כִּי, *quod*, in *v.* 13, the purport of the proclamation is unfolded. The preterites state what is actually past; the deed of God is the presupposition of the proclamation praising Him on its account. This deed consists in the avenging and delivering of the Church, which is persecuted even unto blood. אוֹתָם, standing emphatically before its verb, points to those mentioned in what follows (cf. *v.* 21); the *Chethîb* calls them עֲנִיִּים, the *Kerî*, עֲנָוִים. In other places also these two words alternate, the *Kerî* sometimes using the one and sometimes the other instead of the term that stands in the text. They both go back upon עָנָה, to bow one's self down (to bring down, Isa. xxv. 5). As is evident from the substantive, עֲנָוָה, which does not mean suffering, affliction, but passivity, *i.e.* humility and meekness, it is the neuter signification of the verb עָנָה = עָנַו (عنا, *fut. o*) that underlies the noun עָנִי, (Chald. עֲנִי, Dan. iv. 24, after the form חֲטִי, plur. עֲנָיִן), for which the *Kerî* incorrectly gives עֲנָיִי in Num. xii. 3 (like שֲׁלֵי, Job xxi. 23); while the noun עָנִי is passive and, therefore, does not, like עָנָו (عَانٍ), denote the one who is in a condition of עֲנָוָה, *i.e.* one who is lowly minded, but like معنو, *m'anûw*,

the one who is in a condition of עֳנִי (oppression, misery, affliction), *i.e.* one who is bowed down by calamity. Seeing, however, that in the school of affliction one acquires the twin virtues denoted by עֲנָוָה, there is associated also with עֳנִי, but only secondarily, the idea of the ethical inwardness which is aimed at by trials and troubles, and which is conjoined with a life full of suffering rather than with one of worldly prosperity; but, as Num. xii. 3 shows, this ethical condition is properly described by עָנָו (*ταπεινός* and *πραΰς*). It is to be proclaimed beyond Israel, even among the heathen, that the avenger of blood, דֹּרֵשׁ דָּמִים, has thought upon these, His דְּרוּשִׁים, and has therefore been as sedulously concerned about them as they about Him. דָּמִים always means human blood shed violently or morbidly; the plural is the *plur.* of the product; דָּרַשׁ, to demand back from any one that which he has destroyed, and therefore to demand a reckoning, indemnification, satisfaction for it (Gen. ix. 5), then directly to punish (2 Chron. xxiv. 22).

Vers. 14, 15. Seeing that what is entreated here appears in the preceding and also in the following strophes as something that has already taken place, it destroys the uniform hymnic character of the Psalm, to take this strophe as a prayer of David at the present time; it sets before us the manner in which the עֲנִיִּים (עֲנָוִים) cried to Jahve previous to the deliverance they have now experienced. Instead of חָנֵּנִי, which is used everywhere else, the resolved and, as it were, tremulous form חָנְנֵנִי is purposely chosen. A better attested reading is חָנֻנֵּנִי (with *Pathach* and *Gaja* in the first syllable); by Chajug and others (*vid.* König, *Lehrg.*, p. 366) this is regarded as the *imper. Piel*, whose signification (Prov. xxvi. 25) is not suitable here; it is more correctly (Ew., § 251 *c*) taken as the *imper. Kal* from the intransitive imperative form חָנַן (cf. lxxx. 16, וְכַנָּה),—an alternative which Kimchi (*Michlol*, 147 *b*) already offered. מְרוֹמְמִי is vocative (cf. xvii. 7). The gates of death, *i.e.* the gates of the realm of the dead

(יְאוֹל, Isa. xxxviii. 10), are in the deep; he who is in peril of death has sunk down to them; he who is delivered from peril of death is lifted up, so that they do not swallow him up and close behind him. To the God who can rescue from death, the Church, which found itself already close by its gates, raised its cry. Its ultimate design in so doing was that it might glorify God. The form תְּהַלָּתֶיךָ is *sing.* with a *plur.* suffix, just like שְׂנֵאתֶיךָ in Ezek. xxxv. 11, and אֲשְׁמָתֵינוּ in Ezra ix. 15. As עֲצָתֶיךָ in Isa. xlvii. 13 shows, those who pointed the text admitted the possibility of *plur.* suffixes being attached to a collective singular. The gates of the daughter of Zion, which are above the earth, are set over against the under-world gates of death. צִיּוֹן is *gen. appositionis* (Ges., § 116, 5); the daughter of Zion (Zion itself) is the Church, standing in a filial, bridal, and conjugal relation to Jahve. "In the gates of the daughter of Zion" is equivalent to "before all the people of God" (cxvi. 14); for the gates are the places where people gather together and engage in discussion. The sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament as yet know nothing of hymns of praise sung by the blessed in heaven. On the other side of the grave is silent death. If the Church is to praise, she must live and not die.

Vers. 16, 17. And, as this ט-strophe says, she can praise; for she has been delivered from death, and those who devised her death have themselves fallen a prey to death. Having taken the ח-strophe as a presentation to us of the earlier צָעֲקַת עֲנִיִּים, we do not need, with Seb. Schmidt, to supply in thought a *dicendo* or *dicturus* before this one; the preterites that preceded the ח-strope, and celebrate that which has just been experienced, are continued here. The verb טָבַע (√טב, whence also טֶבֶל) means originally to press upon anything with something flat, to impress one's self upon, then, as here and in lxix. 3, 15, to sink down or in. The attributive עָשׂוּ (cf. יִפְעָל, vii. 16) has זוּ טָמְנוּ (pausal form with *Mugrasch*) corresponding to it in the parallel member. זוּ, the gender of

which is common, was joined to רֶשֶׁת by *Makkef*, because it was taken to be demonstrative, as in xii. 8: the net there (which they have hidden). The punctuation of the text, it is true, recognises זוּ relative (xvii. 9, lxviii. 29); for the most part, however, it takes it as a demonstrative, connecting it closely with the preceding noun, either by *Makkef* (xxxii. 8, lxii. 12, cxlii. 4, cxliii. 8), or by marking the noun with a conjunctive accent (x. 2, xxxi. 5, cxxxii. 12). The verb טָמַן corresponds to the Arab. كمن in كَمِين, ambush (cf. מַכְמֹר), and לָכַד (Arab. to adhere to, to press against, to crowd, iv. to hold fast) has in Hebrew the signification of seizing and catching. In *v.* 17 Ben-Naftali vocalises נוֹדַע, with *ā*: Jahve is known (*part. Niph.*); *the textus receptus*, however, following Ben-Ascher, points it נוֹדַע: Jahve has made Himself known (*3rd pers. perf. Niph.* in a reflexive signification, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 23). By what means Jahve has made Himself known is stated forthwith: He has held a judgment or executed right, by snaring the wicked (רָשָׁע, as in *v.* 6) in his own work, which he craftily and perseveringly designed for Israel's destruction. So Gussetius has already interpreted it. נוֹקֵשׁ is *part. Kal* of נָקֵשׁ, a secondary form of יָקֹשׁ (נקשׁ) attested by Deut. xii. 30 (cf. vii. 25). If it were the *part. Niph.* of יָקַשׁ, the *ē* which occurs elsewhere only in a few ע״ע verbs (as *e.g.* נָמֵס, *liquefactus*) would be without example. We must not, however, translate it with Ges. and Hengst.: "the wicked snareth himself in the work of his own hands," in which case we should have to follow the old versions and vocalise it נוֹקַשׁ (*3rd præt. Niph.*); but with Hupf. and Riehm: "snaring the wicked in the work of his own hands." Jahve is the subject, and the suffix refers to the wicked; the thought is the same as in Job xxxiv. 11; Isa. i. 31. This figure of the net, רֶשֶׁת (from יָרַשׁ, *capere*) is peculiar to the Psalms entitled לדוד. Here, as סלה demands, the music, and indeed, as the combination הגיון סלה indicates, the playing of the stringed instruments (xcii. 4) increases; or the music increases after

a solo of the latter. Here the hymn of praise soars aloft to the climax of triumph.

Vers. 18, 19. Just, however, as in *vv.* 8 ff. there opened up from Jahve's act of judgment that had just been witnessed the prospect of a final and universal judgment, so here also the laudatory retrospect of what has just happened passes over into a confident intuition of the future, which is thereby guaranteed. The LXX. renders יָשׁוּבוּ by *ἀποστραφήτωσαν*, Jerome by *convertantur*, which it may signify (cf. *e.g.* 2 Chron. xviii. 25)'; but why not *ἀναστραφήτωσαν*, or, since *v.* 19 shows that *v.* 18 is not a wish, but a sure anticipation, rather: *ἀναστραφήσονται*? Resolution into dust, sinking into nothingness (*redactio in pulverem, in nihilum*) is the return of man, who was formed from the dust, and called out of nothing into being, to his original condition; to die is to return to the dust (civ. 29; cf. Gen. iii. 19); here it is called a return to Sheôl, as in Job xxx. 23 to death, and in xc. 3 to the condition of atoms, inasmuch as the condition of shadowy existence in Hades, the condition of death, the condition of corruption, is to a certain extent the repristination of that which man was ere he became. As regards outward form, לִישְׁעָתָה (lxxx. 3) may be compared with לִשְׁאוֹלָה; in both instances the ל is that of direction or aim, which might stand before שְׁאוֹלָה, if for no other reason than that this may signify *ἐν ᾅδου* as well as *εἰς ᾅδου* (cf. מִבָּבֶלָה, Jer. xxvii. 16). R. Abba b. Zabda in *Genesis Rabba*, c. 50 and 68, explains the twofold indication of the direction whither as being intended to give intensity to the idea: into the lowest chamber of hell (cf. Levy, *Neuhebr. W. B*, under דַּיְיטֵי, *δίαιτα*). In other places also prepositions of direction are combined with ה local (*e.g.* אֶל־הַיָּמָּה, לְמִזְרָחָה in Ezek. xlvii. 8, and the like), seeing that the signification of the latter was being gradually forgotten. The heathen receive the epithet שְׁכְחֵי אֱלֹהִים (which is more neuter than שֹׁכְחֵי, l. 22); for God has not so left Himself without a witness among them, that they could not know of

Him; their alienation from God is a forgetfulness of God for which they are personally guilty, and from which they should return unto Him (Isa. xix. 22). Because, however, they do not do so, and even oppose themselves in a hostile manner to the people and the God of redemption, they must return to the earth and indeed to Hades, in order that the persecuted Church may obtain its longed-for peace and its promised dominion. Jahve will ultimately acknowledge this *ecclesia pressa;* and although its hope is ready to perish, inasmuch as its fulfilment is being continually deferred, nevertheless it will not always be so. The strongly accented לֹא dominates both the members of *v.* 19, just as in xxxv. 19, xxxviii. 2, and also frequently elsewhere (Ew., § 351*a*). אֶבְיוֹן, from אָבָה, to wish, is the one that longs for anything, *i.e.* the one that is needy; the Arab. أَبَى, which means the very opposite, and according to which it would mean "he who restrains (himself)," viz. because he must, has to be left out of account.

Vers. 20, 21. On the ground of the act of judgment, that has already been witnessed, there now arises so much the more confident a petition in respect of the situation, which still continues to be threatening. The poet leaps over from י to ק, which, however, seeing that the following Psalm begins with ל, seems to take the place of ב, which one would naturally expect. The Davidic קוּמָה (iii. 8, vii. 7) is taken from the mouth of Moses (Num. x. 35). "Jahve arises, comes, appears" are in the Old Testament kindred expressions, which all point to a final, personal, and visible interposition of God in the history of man, from which He has at present withdrawn as it were into the quiescent state of invisibility. Hupfeld and others render אַל־יָעֹז אֱנוֹשׁ wrongly: "let not man grow strong"; the verb עָזַז does not mean merely to be or to become strong, but also to feel one's self to be strong, powerful, possessed of power, and to bear one's self accordingly; as the Arabic shows, it originally signifies

to stiffen one's self, to oppose, resist, and therefore to brave or defy (lii. 9), just as עַז means defiant, impudent (cf. the post-biblical עַזּוּת, shamelessness). As in 2 Chron. xiv. 10, אֱנוֹשׁ is man, impotent in comparison with God, and frail in himself. The enemies of the Church of God are not unfrequently designated by this name, which points to the impotence of their spurious power (Isa. li. 7, 12). David prays that God may put a stop to the arrogance of these presumptuous ones by arising and manifesting Himself in all the greatness of His omnipotence, now that His forbearance has so long seemed to them to be helplessness. He is to arise as the Judge of the world; judging the heathen, inasmuch as they must appear before Him and, as it were, defile before Him (עַל־פָּנֶיךָ), He is to set מוֹרָה for them. The signification "razor" gives a figure that is expressed ambiguously, a figure, indeed, that is here an unbecoming one, if, after Isa. vii. 20, we may think of a contumelious shaving of the head or a cutting of the throat; the translation: teacher, lawgiver, master (LXX., Syr., Vulg., Luth.), in accordance with which Schwartzkopf in his *Psalmenklügen* (1883) entitles Ps. ix. "the teacher of the proud," rests upon the reading מוֹרֶה, which we do not agree with Thenius, Baethgen and others in preferring to the traditional one (in accordance with which Jerome renders: *pone, Domine, terrorem eis*);[1] for מוֹרָה, according to the Masora instead of מוֹרָא (like מִכְלָה, Hab. iii. 17, for מִכְלָא), is perfectly suitable. Hitzig objects that fear is not a thing that one sets for one; but מוֹרָא does not merely mean fear, but also an object, and, as Hitzig himself explains it in Mal. ii. 5, a "lever," of fear. It is neither meant that God is to cause them to be overcome with terror (עַל), nor that He is to put terror into them (בְּ), but that He is to set an object of terror for them (לְ, exactly as in xxi. 4, cxl. 6; Job xiv. 3), from which they shall come to know

[1] So also Juan de Valdés in his *Salterio*, edited by Böhmer (1880): *Pon, SEÑOR, temor a ellos.*

(Hosea ix. 7) to their dismay, as 21 *b* further wishes, that they are mortal men. As in x. 12, xlix. 12, l. 21, lxiv. 6, Gen. xii. 13, Job xxxv. 14, Amos v. 12, Hosea vii. 2, יֵדְעוּ is followed by only half indirect speech without כִּי or אֲשֶׁר. According to the rule of the אתי מרחיק (on which *vid.* on lii. 5), סֶלָה has *Day. forte conj.*, it being taken as an integral portion of the text.

PSALM X.

A PRAYER OF COMPLAINT AND SUPPLICATION UNDER THE PRESSURE OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN HEATHENISH FOES.

1 ל Why, Jahve, standest Thou afar off,
Why hidest Thou Thyself in times of hopeless trouble?
2 Through the pride of the wicked the afflicted is set on fire,
They are caught in the plots, which those have devised.

3 For the wicked glorieth in his soul's desire,
And the covetous man renounceth, contemneth Jahve.
4 The wicked in his superciliousness:—"He will by no means punish!
There is no God!" is the sum of his thoughts.

5 His ways are stable at all times;
Thy judgments are as remote as the heavens from his field of vision;
As for all his adversaries, he puffeth at them.

6 He saith in his heart: I shall by no means be moved,
For all generations I am he whom no misfortune befalls.
7 His mouth is full of cursing and deceit and oppression,
Under his tongue are mischief and iniquity.

8 He sitteth in the lurking-places of the villages,
In hiding-places he striketh down the innocent;
As for his eyes, they are on the watch against the weak.

9 He lieth in wait in the hiding-place like a lion in his lair,
He lieth in wait to carry off the afflicted,
He carrieth off the afflicted, dragging him away in his net.

10 He croucheth, he boweth down, and there fall into his claws—the weak.
11 He saith in his heart: "God hath forgotten,
He hath hidden His face, He hath never seen."

12 ק Arise, Jahve; O God, lift up Thy hand,
Forget not the sufferers!
13 Wherefore may the wicked blaspheme the Deity,
Saying in his heart: Thou dost not punish?

14 ר Thou dost indeed see it; for Thou beholdest mischief and grief, to lay it in Thine hand;
To Thee the weak committeth his all,
To the orphan Thou showest Thyself rich in help.

15 ש Break Thou the arm of the wicked,
And as for the evil man—punish his wickedness, that it may vanish from before Thee!
16 Jahve is King for ever and ever,
The heathen are perished from His land.

17 ת Jahve, Thou hast heard the desire of the sufferers,
Thou didst make their heart firm, Thine ear attentive,
18 To right the orphan and the oppressed,
That man which is of the earth may no more terrify.

This Psalm and Ps. xxxiii. are the only anonymous Psalms in book i. There is something peculiar, however, about Ps. x. The LXX. combines it and Ps. ix. into one, and not without a certain justification. They are both laid out in tetrastichs; only in its middle portion Ps. x. mixes up strophes of three lines with strophes of four. And on the assumption that the ק-strophe, with which Ps. ix. concludes, takes the place of a כ-strophe which was to be expected after the י-strophe, Ps. x., beginning with ל, continues the sequence of the letters; at any rate it commences in the middle of the alphabet, whereas Ps. ix. commences at its beginning. It is true this ל-strophe is followed by strophes

that are not arranged alphabetically; but the number of these is exactly the same as the number of the letters that come between ל and ק, ר, שׁ, ת, with which the four last strophes of the Psalm begin, viz. 6, corresponding to the letters מ, נ, ס, ע, פ, צ, which are not represented acrostically.[1] Moreover Pss. ix. and x. are most intimately related to one another by such uncommon expressions as לְעִתּוֹת בַּצָּרָה and דַּךְ, by their using such words in the same sense as אֱנוֹשׁ and גּוֹיִם, by such striking thoughts as "Jahve doth not forget" and "arise," and by such peculiarities of style as the use of the *oratio directa* instead of *obliqua* (ix. 21, x. 13). And yet it is impossible that the two Psalms should be only one. Notwithstanding all their community of character, they are radically different. Ps. ix. is a Psalm of thanksgiving, Ps. x. a Psalm of supplication. In the latter, the ego of the singer, which is prominent in the former, remains entirely in the background. The enemies, for the overthrow of whom Ps. ix. gives thanks, and whose ultimate removal it anticipates, are גּוֹיִם, and therefore foreign foes; whereas in Ps. x. it is apostates and persecutors belonging to his native country that stand in the foreground, and גוים are mentioned only in the two concluding strophes. As regards their form also, the two Psalms are so far different as Ps. x. contains no note indicating that it was meant to be accompanied by music, and, as we have already remarked, the tetrastichic structure of the strophe in Ps. ix. is not carried out with the same consistency in Ps. x. Is there

[1] In Syriac also there are irregular alphabetical hymns, and, indeed, even some that must have been composed in this form by Ephraim himself, *e.g.* the Nisibene poem, which begins with א, ב, and concludes with פ, צ, ק, ר, שׁ, ת, but in the middle does not confine itself to any definite sequence of the letters, although there too there are a few attempts at an alphabetical arrangement (ח, ט, כ, ל). Notwithstanding this, both external and internal reasons leave no doubt, that we still possess this poem exactly in the form in which it proceeded from Ephraim's pen. *Vid.* G. Bickell in *D.M.Z.*, xxvi. 809–11.

then anything wanting to the perfect unity of Ps. ix.? If we read it along with Ps. x., *uno tenore*, the latter becomes a tail which disfigures it. There are only two possibilities: Ps. x. is a supplement to Ps. ix., composed either by David himself or by some other poet, and closely connected with it by the carrying out of the alphabetical arrangement. The circumstance, that Ps. x. is not inferior to Ps. ix. as regards the antiquity of its language and the originality of its thoughts, compels us to reject the latter possibility. Accordingly, the mutual coincidences prove that both are by the same author, and the two Psalms must be regarded as "two co-ordinate halves of one whole, which is possessed of a higher unity" (Hitz.). The harsh, obscure, and lapidarically terse language of deep indignation at moral abominations, for which the language has as it were no suitable terms, we hear also elsewhere in Psalms of David and of his time,—those Psalms which we are wont to call Psalms written in an angry style.

Vers. 1, 2. The Psalm begins with the plaintive inquiry, why Jahve delays to deliver His oppressed ones. It is not captious murmuring that is expressed in the question, but an earnest longing that God would not delay to act in such a manner as His nature and His promise demand. לָמָּה, with the accent on the last syllable, and belonging to both the members of the sentence, stands for לָמָה, with the accent on the penult (just as, *e.g.*, before עֲזַבְתָּנִי in xxii. 2, and הֲרֵעֹתָה in Ex. v. 22), in order that neither of the two gutturals that are pointed with *a* should be slurred over in rapid speaking (cf. on iii. 8);[1] for according to the primitive

[1] According to the Masora, לָמָה without *Dag.* is always *Milra*, with the single exception of Job vii. 20, while לָהַט with *Dag.* is *Milel;* if, however, the following closely connected word begins with one of the letters, אהע, לָמָה becomes *Milra*, with five exceptions, viz. xlix. 6, 1 Sam. xxviii. 15; 2 Sam. xiv. 31 (three passages in which the guttural of the following words has the vowel *i*), 2 Sam. ii. 22, and Jer. xv. 18. In

pronunciation we must read *lamáh Adonaj*. The poet asks, why it is that in the present hopeless condition of affairs (as to בַּצָּרָה *vid.* on ix. 10) Jahve stands afar off (בְּרָחוֹק only here, instead of כִּמֶרְחוֹק, which is used elsewhere) like an idle spectator, and why He veils (תַּעְלִים, with orthophonic *Dag.*, in order that we may not pronounce it תַּעֲלִים), viz. His eyes, as if in order that He may not see the desperate condition of His people, or even His ears (Lam. iii. 56), as if in order not to hear their supplication. For by reason of the insolent behaviour of the ungodly, the hapless one burns, not with indignation (Hengst.), but with anguish (Ges., Stier, Hupf.). The temptation is a πύρωσις (1 Pet. iv. 12); the verb דָּלַק, which reminds one of דַּלֶּקֶת, πυρετός, is perhaps chosen with reference to the fact, that the fiery trial is the consequence of the persecution, the (בּוֹ) דְּלֹק אַחֲרָיו, of the godless. Seeing that עָנִי and רָשָׁע are individualising designations of two different classes of men, there is no harshness in the transition from the singular to the plural. The subject of יִתָּפְשׂוּ are the עֲנִיִּים, and that of חָשְׁבוּ, the רְשָׁעִים. The *impff.* describe what usually takes place. Those who are otherwise afflicted are caught in the treacherous and malicious devices, which the ungodly have contrived and devised against them, without being able to extricate themselves. The punctuation, which assigns *Tarcha* to זוּ, construes the relative wrongly, and interprets: "in the plots there, which they have devised."

Vers. 3, 4. The prominent features of the situation are now set forth more in detail. The preterites express those characteristics of the wicked which reveal themselves in their daily life; הִלֵּל, to praise aloud, usually with the accusative, here with עַל of the thing, of which one is proud. Far from concealing the shameful lust or inordinate desire (cxii.

the Babylonian system of punctuation, לְמָה is always written without *Dag.* and with the accent upon the penult. Vid. Pinsker, *Einleitung in das Babylonisch-hebräische Punktationssystem*, pp. 182–184.

10) of his soul, he makes it the subject and ground of loud and high-sounding praise, imagining as he does that he is raised above all divine and human restraint. So also Riehm against Hupfeld's rendering: "and the robber he blesses, (but) blasphemes Jahve." The רָשָׁע, who brings the fiery trial upon the pious, is himself a בֹּצֵעַ, a covetous or rapacious person; for this name is given (usually with בָּצַע, Prov. i. 19, or בָּצַע רַע, Hab. ii. 9) not only to the person who "cuts off" (يَضع), *i.e.* makes unjust gain, by means of trade, but also to him who does so by means of plunder (πλεονέκτης). Although in later Talmudic Hebrew, the verb בָּרַךְ (here with *Mugrasch*, as in Num. xxiii. 20 with *Tifcha*: בָּרֵךְ) directly signifies *maledicere* (whence בִּרְכַּת הַשֵּׁם, blasphemy, *Sanhedrin* 56 *a* and freq.), it nowhere does so in the Bible; in biblical Hebrew, however, it undoubtedly means to take leave of any one with a benediction, then to bid farewell, to dismiss, to discard and renounce altogether (Job i. 5 and freq.). The two statements in *v.* 3 *b*, which are not connected by a conjunction, form a climax, like Isa. i. 4; Amos iv. 5; Jer. xv. 7. נִאֵץ, literally to sting, prick, is used of utter rejection in word and deed.[1] In *v.* 4, "the wicked according to his superciliousness" (cf. Prov. xvi. 18) is *nom. absol.*, and בַּל־יִדְרֹשׁ אֵין אֱלֹהִים (contrary to the accentuation) is virtually a predicate to כָּל־מְזִמּוֹתָיו. This word, which in *v.* 2 denotes the intrigues of the ungodly, has here the general signification: thoughts (from זָמַם, זָמַם, *comprimere*, said of concentration of thought, *vid.* xvii. 3), not, however, without the secondary idea, deep, artful, an idea that is easily associated with the general sense we have just given to the term. The whole current of his thoughts is, *i.e.* proceeds from and issues in the notion, that He (viz. Jahve, whom

[1] *Pasek* stands between נאץ and יהוה, because to blaspheme God is a horrible thought—a thought not to be uttered without hesitation. Cf. the *Pasek* in lxxiv. 18, lxxxix. 52; Isa. xxxvii. 24 (2 Kings xix. 23).

he will not even name) will by no means punish (בַּל, the strongest form of subjective negation), and that there is really no God at all. The second opinion follows from the first; for to deny the existence of a living, energising, all-punishing (in one word, a personal) God, is virtually to deny the existence of any true God (Ew.).

Ver. 5. This strophe, which consists of only three lines, describes his happiness, in the enjoyment of which he suffers nothing to disturb him. The signification, to be enduring, a signification which proceeds from the root idea, to be intertwined, to be drawn tight, to be compressed, is guaranteed to the verb חִיל (whence חַיִל) by Job xx. 21: let him take whichever ways he chooses, they always lead him to his goal; he stands fast, he neither stumbles nor goes astray (cf. Jer. xii. 1). The *Chetîb* דרכו (דְּרָכָו) is not meant in any other sense than the *Kerî* (cf. xxiv. 6, lviii. 8). Nothing that might embitter this happiness of his troubles him: neither the judgments of God, which are removed from his field of vision as far as heaven is distant from the earth, and consequently cause him no pangs of conscience (cf. xxviii. 5, Isa. v. 12, and the converse, xviii. 23), nor his adversaries, whom he blows upon with an air of contempt. מָרוֹם is the predicate: *altissime remota*. And בְּ הָפִיחַ, to breathe upon, by no means signifies: actually to blow away or down (for which נָשַׁב or נָשַׁף would have been used), but either to snub, or what suits 5*b* better, to blow upon one disdainfully, to snuff at one, like הָפִיחַ in Mal. i. 13 and the Arab. نفخ (√נח, to breathe deeply, to snort; cf. נָחַר) with على or even with ب, to plume oneself against any one. For the construction, cf. בְּ מָאַס, בְּ בָּעַט, and the like. The meaning is not, that he blows away his foes with little trouble, but that by his proud and scornful bearing he gives them to understand how little they concern him.

Vers. 6, 7. In his boundless carnal security he gives free course to his wicked tongue. That which the believer can

say on the ground of his fellowship with God: בַּל-אֶמּוֹט (xxx. 7, xvi. 8), the wicked says in godless self-confidence. The following אֲשֶׁר cannot be equivalent to ὅτι *recitativum* as in 2 Sam. i. 4 (Hitz., Riehm): "from generation to generation I shall not be in adversity"; for in that case it must have stood before לְדֹר, or rather before בַּל; nor does the אשׁר of Zech. viii. 20, 23 serve to introduce the divine words. Here, as frequently in the language of poetry, אֲשֶׁר signifies: he who, or: such an one as. The godless looks upon himself for age and age, *i.e.* throughout the endless future, as אֲשֶׁר לֹא בְרָע, *i.e.* as one who (אֲשֶׁר as in Isa. viii. 20) will not be in evil case (בְּרָע as in Ex. v. 19; 2 Sam. xvi. 8). We might perhaps also interpret it after the analogy of Zech. viii. 20, 23 (*vid.* Köhler *in loc.*): in all the future (it will come to pass) that I shall not be in adversity. But in that case the personal pronoun (אֲנִי or הוּא) ought not to have been wanting, whereas according to our interpretation it is supplied from אֶמּוֹט; and there is no need to supply it at all, if we look upon the clause as standing in apposition: in all future time he who, etc. Such being his unbounded self-confidence, his mouth is full of אָלָה, cursing, *execratio* (not perjury, *perjurium*, for אָלָה, آلى, signifies, to asseverate anything before God in a general sense), מִרְמוֹת, deceit and craft of every kind, תּוֹךְ, oppression and violence, from תָּכַךְ, تَكَّ, perhaps a secondary form of أَكَّ and وكأ, وكا, *comprimere, firmare* (cf. תָּוֶךְ from תּוֹךְ, the middle, so named from the idea of compression or condensation, like صميم القلب, the thick = the centre of the heart). And that which he has under his tongue, and, therefore, always in readiness to be uttered (cxl. 4; cf. lxvi. 17), is trouble for others and in itself consummate vileness. In Rom. iii. 14, Paul has interwoven this *v.* 7 into his mosaic description of human corruption.

Ver. 8. The godless is described as a highwayman, a description which reminds us of such anarchical conditions

as are depicted, *e.g.* in Hos. vi. 9. The figure, moreover, fixes upon one individual feature, in which the vileness of the godless culminates; and it is possible that the representation is meant emblematically rather than literally. חָצֵר (from חָצַר, to surround; cf. حظر، حصر, and especially حضر), is properly the walled in court-yard of a farm (Arab. *ḥaḍar*, *ḥaḍâr*, *ḥaḍâra*), then, dropping the special notion of being walled in, a fixed settlement generally (with a house of clay or stone) as distinguished from roaming about in tents (cf. Lev. xxv. 31; Gen. xxv. 17). Here, where men are more certain to fall into his hands than in the steppe, he lies in wait (יֵשֵׁב, like لَ قعد, *subsedit=insidiatus est ei*), slays unobserved him who had given him no occasion for vengeance, and his eyes יִצְפְּנוּ לְחֶלְכָה. Instead of the verb צָפָה, צָפַן, to spy (xxxvii. 32), might have been used; but צָפַן also comes to signify, to lie in ambush (lvi. 7; Prov. i. 11, 18), its primary meaning, to flatten, passing over into that of repressing, constraining one's self, to spy, to note, a meaning to which a transitive turn is given in צָפַן, to guard, conceal.[1] The dativ al object, חֶלְכָה, is pointed as if it came from חַיִל, Thy host, *i.e.* Thy Church, O Jahve. The pausal form in *v.* 14 is accordingly חֶלְכָה, with *Segol*, not, as in incorrect impressions, with *Zere*. The objection to this view, which is found in the plur. חלכאים of *v.* 10, is obviated by the circumstance that, as the *Kerî* (which the Syriac follows) and the Masora indicate, this plural is taken as a double word: host (חֵיל=חַיִל, from חַיִל, as in Obad. *v.* 20) of afflicted ones (כָּאִים, not, as Ben-Labrat assumes, instead of נְכָאִים, but from כָּאָה, stale and rotten and decayed), and is accordingly pointed חֶלְכָאִים, with *Zere*. The punctuation, therefore, sets aside a word that was incomprehensible to it, and cannot

[1] Cf. the paronomasia in *Erubin*, 53 *b*: let us see, הַצָּפִינְנוּ, where Rabbi Al'âi is concealed (צָפוּן). In the language of the Bedouins, ضفن, *fut. i*, signifies to be still, meditative, absorbed in thought.

bind us. There is really a verb, חָלַךְ, which does not, it is true, occur in the Old Testament; in Arabic, however, it is derived from the root حلك, *firmus fuit, firmum fecit* (whence also حكل, intr. to be firm, *fermé*, *i.e.* closed), and therefore, as applied to colours, comes to have the meaning, to be dark (cf. חַכְלִילִי, very dark, Assyr. *iklîtu*, darkness), in exactly the same way as חָשַׁךְ (*vid.* on 2 Sam. xxii. 12), and is also transferred to the darkness and blackness of misfortune.[1] From this verb there is formed an abstract noun, חֶלֶךְ or חֵלֶךְ (like חֹפֶשׁ): blackness, misfortune, or even weakness of mind; and from this again an adj., חֶלְכִּי=חֶלְבָּה, or even (cf. עֶלְפָּה, חֶפְשִׁי, Ezek. xxxi. 15, one in a condition of languishing, עֵלֶף) חֶלְבָּה =חֶלְכִּי, *plur.* חֶלְבָּאִים, after the analogy of the form דּוּדָאִים, from דּוּדִי (cf. נִדְבָּאִים, from נִדְבָּה=נִדְבִּי). *Vid.* Ew., § 189 *g*.

Ver. 9. The representation of the רָשָׁע as one who has become a beast of prey is now worked out still further. The *lustrum* of the lion is called סֹךְ (Jer. xxv. 38) or סֻכָּה (Job xxxviii. 40): the covert or thicket, from סָכַךְ, which signifies both to plait and to plait over=to cover (without any connection with שׂוֹךְ, a thorn, Arab. *śôk*, a thistle). The figure of the lion is reversed in the second line, the עָנִי himself being compared to a beast of prey, and the רָשָׁע to a hunter, who carries off the former (חָטַף, חָתַף, *abripere*, *corripere*), inasmuch as by means of his net he draws him to himself (Hos. xi. 4), *i.e.* catches him (Job xl. 25). The ב is that of the instrument, just as in Deut. xxi. 3: the beast of draught draws the plough or wagon, בְּעוֹל, by means of the yoke.

Vers. 10, 11. The comparison to a lion is still in force

[1] Cf. Samachschari's *Goldene Halsbänder*, Proverb 67, where Fleischer translates: "which is blacker: the plumage of the raven, which is coal-black, or thy life, O stranger among strangers?" The "blacker" is expressed here by أَحْلَك, just as the verb حَلَك, with its infinitives حَلَك or حُلْكَة, and its derivatives, is elsewhere applied to sorrow and misery (cf. חֲשׁוֹךְ, the Targum word for דַּל and אֶבְיוֹן).

here, and the description turns back to its commencement in the second strophe, tracing the behaviour of the godless to its ultimate cause. Instead of the *Chethîb*, ודכה (וְדָכָה, *perf. consec.*), the *Kerî* reads יְדֻכָּה (not, as one might rather expect, יְדֻכֶּה), which is more in accordance with the use of the tenses in Hebrew. For the interpretation Job xxxviii. 40 is normative. The two imperfects describe the persistent, secret lying in wait of the robber. It is true there is no other instance of the *Kal* דָּכָה in the signification "to stoop"; but even if we may not appeal to תָּכָה (which is itself questionable): to stoop down, to cower (Deut. xxiii. 3), and to שָׁכַךְ=תָּכַךְ, Jer. v. 26 (cf. however, *e.g.* דָּלָה and תָּלָה) yet the Arab. *dakka*, to make smooth (cf. دصّ, *firmiter inhæsit loco*, said of the beast of prey, hunter, or enemy that has crouched down), and the Arab. *daǵǵa* (which is compared by Hitzig): to slink, to creep, and *duǵǵa*, a hunter's hiding-place, are kindred terms, and the ταπεινώσει αὐτόν of the LXX. is not far amiss.[1] The only other interpretation proposed is to read וְדָכָה יָשַׁח: and being crushed, he sinks (Aq. ὁ δὲ θλασθεὶς καμφθήσεται); but even דָּכָה does not occur elsewhere, and if the poet had meant that, why should he not have written נִדְכָּה (cf. also Judg. v. 27)? Besides, חלכאים would, according to that interpretation, be the subject of three preceding verbs, which is contrary to the genius of the Hebrew language. If we take דָּכָה in the sense of assuming a position in which one is least likely to be observed, the two first verbs are meant to refer to the assassin, while the third is, according to the usual construction (as *e.g.* in cxxiv. 5), a predicate to חֶלְכָּאִים (חֶלְכָּאִים) going before it. Crouching down and bending low he lies on the watch, and the weak and defenceless fall into his strong ones, עֲצוּמָיו, *i.e.* his claws.

[1] As to a second possibility, viz. that תָּכָה is to be taken as a secondary form of ﭐتَكَّا (from وَكَّا), *nixum esse, recumbere, vid.* Volck on Deut. xxxiii. 3.

Thus the ungodly slays the pious, thinking all the time within himself: God has forgotten, He has hidden His face, *i.e.* He does not concern Himself about these poor wights, and prefers to know nothing about them (a denial of the truth expressed in ix. 13, 19), He has never been one that sees, nor will He ever be. These two thoughts are blended together; בַּל, followed by the *perf.*, as in xxi. 3, and with the addition of לָנֶצַח (cf. xciv. 7), denies the possibility of God seeing after, any more than before the event, as if it were an absolute absurdity. A personal God would disturb the ungodly in his doings; he therefore prefers to deny His existence, and thinks: there is only a fate, and that is blind, an absolute, and that has no eyes, an idea, and that cannot intervene in the affairs of men.

Vers. 12, 13. The six strophes, in which the letters צ–מ are wanting, are ended, and now the acrostic strophes begin with one commencing with ק. In contrast to those who have no God, or at least only a dead idol, the psalmist calls upon his God, the living God, to prove by His deeds, that it is a delusion to imagine that He is not an omniscient, self-conscious being. The divine names are heaped up; as in xvi. 1, lxxxiii. 2, cxxxix. 17, 23, אֵל is vocative. He is to lift up His hand in order to help and to punish (נְשָׂא יָד, whence the *imper.* נְשָׂא = שָׂא, cf. נְסָה in iv. 7, like שָׁלַח יָד in cxxxvii. 7 and נָטָה יָד in Ex. vii. 5). "Forget not" is equivalent to: fulfil the לֹא שָׁכַח of ix. 13, put to shame the שָׁכַח אֵל of the ungodly in *v.* 11. Our translation follows the *Kerî*, עֲנָיִים. In *v.* 13 that which is complained of in *vv.* 3 and 4 is put into the form of a question addressed to God: wherefore (עַל־מָה, instead of which עַל־מָה is used in Num. xxii. 32 and Jer. ix. 11, the following words beginning with consonants that belong to a different class) does that come to pass? *i.e.* wherefore is it allowed to come to pass? On the *perff.* in this interrogative clause, *vid.* on xi. 3. מַדּוּעַ inquires as to the cause, לָמָּה as to the purpose, and על־מה as to the motive,

or in general as to the ground: on what ground, seeing that God's holiness can endure no violation of His honour? On לֹא תִדְרֹשׁ without כִּי, *orat. directa* instead of *obliqua*, *vid.* on ix. 21.

Ver. 14. The ground of his cry to Jahve is now assigned: it is with Him altogether different from what the ungodly imagine. They are of opinion that He does not punish; but He sees (cf. 2 Chron. xxiv. 22), and the psalmist knows and confesses this: רָאִתָה (written defectively for רָאִיתָה, xxxv. 22), Thou hast seen and dost see what is done to Thine own, what is done to innocent ones. Arguing *a genere ad speciem*, he grounds this assertion upon the fact that, the trouble which is prepared for others, and the sorrow (כַּעַס, as in Eccles. vii. 3) which is caused them, does not escape God's all-seeing eyes; He observes it all, in order to give (put) it into His hand. "To give into any one's hand" is equivalent to "deliver into his power" (1 Kings xx. 28, and freq.), or "commit to any one's charge" (Gen. xxxii. 17, and freq.); here, however, God gives (puts) into His own hand, not things that are to be administered, but things that are to be requited, an idea which is to be understood after the analogy of lvi. 9 (cf. Isa. xlix. 16): He observes the afflictions of His own, putting them into His own hand and preserving them there, in order to give them back in due time, to them as joys, to their foes as punishments. Thus, therefore, the weak and helpless (read חָלְבָּה or חֶלְבָּה; according to the Masoretic text, חֶלְכָה, Thy host, not חֶלְכָה, which as pausal form for חֶלְבָּה is contrary to the rules which govern the change of vowels) can commit to Him, viz. all his solicitude (יָהֹבוֹ, lv. 23), everything that grieves and disquiets him. Jahve was and is one that succours the fatherless. יָתוֹם stands emphatically at the beginning of the clause, like אוֹתָם in ix. 13; and Bakius rightly remarks: *in voce pupilli synecdoche est, complectens omnes illos, qui humanis præsidiis destituuntur.*

Vers. 15, 16. With so much the greater intensity there now rises afresh the prayer for Jahve's energetic intervention. It is a mistake to regard דָּרַשׁ and מָצָא as correlative terms; in the phrase, to seek and not to find, when said of that which has vanished without leaving any trace behind it, it is always בָּקַשׁ and never דָּרַשׁ that is used (xxxvii. 36; Isa. xli. 12; Jer. l. 20, and freq.). Here the verb דָּרַשׁ has no other signification than that which it had in *vv.* 4, 13, and ix. 13: "and the wicked (*nom. absol.*, as in *v.* 4),—O that Thou wouldst punish his wickedness, that Thou wouldst in no wise find it any longer." Even according to this interpretation the correlation between seeking and finding still subsists; for in דרשׁ (synon. פקד) the punishment is conceived of as a visitation, and the thought which is certainly contained in the words, the thought viz. that God would take the wickedness of the wicked so completely out of the way that no trace of it remained, is supplemented by the thought that He would do this by means of a punitive judgment. It is not without deliberation that, instead of employing the form of expression that is used elsewhere (xxxvii. 36; Job xx. 8), the psalmist still addresses his words to Jahve: that which can no longer be found, not merely by the eyes of man, but even by God Himself, has absolutely vanished from the sphere of that which actually exists. Such a conquest of evil is as certainly to be looked for, as that Jahve's universal kingship, which has been an essential element in the faith of God's people ever since the election and redemption of Israel (Ex. xv. 18), cannot remain without a perfect and visible realisation. His absolute and eternal kingship must ultimately be exhibited in all the universality and endless duration predicted in Zech. xiv. 9, Dan. vii. 14, Apoc. xi. 15. Inasmuch as the psalmist is absorbed in the contemplation of this kingship, and beholds the realization of the divine kingdom, the kingdom of the Good, his field of vision is enlarged and embraces not only the domestic foes of the

Church, but also all its foes in general; and inasmuch as to his mind heathen Israel becomes blended along with the non-Israelitic heathen world into one, he comprehends them all in the collective name גּוֹיִם, and beholds the land of Jahve (Lev. xxv. 23), the holy land, purged of the tyrants who are hostile to the Church and its God. It is that which is predicted in Isa. lii. 1, Nah. ii. 1, and elsewhere, that, anticipated in faith, stands here before the mind of the suppliant as an accomplished fact—the consummation viz. of the judgment, which was celebrated as a judgment already partially executed, in the hymnic half (Ps. ix.) of this double Psalm.

Vers. 17, 18. Still tarrying upon this culminating height, the poet revels in the fulfilment of that for which he prayed. The ardent longing of the meek and lowly sufferers for the arising, the *parousia* of Jahve (Isa. xxvi. 8), He has now answered, and that, too, under the circumstances described in the following *impff.*, which are meant to refer to the past: God gave and preserved to their heart its fixed bias towards Himself (תָּכִין, as in lxxviii. 8; Job xi. 13; Sir. ii. 17: ἑτοιμάζειν καρδίας, post-biblical כִּוֵּן,[1] to be understood after 1 Sam. vii. 3; 2 Chron. xx. 33; cf. רוּחַ נָכוֹן (לֵב), li. 12, lxxviii. 37, equivalent to "the single eye" of the New Testament), just as, on the other hand, He set His ear in the attitude of heedful attention to their desire, which was in accordance with His own will (הַקְשִׁיב with אָזְנוֹ as in Prov. ii. 2: to stiffen the ear, from קָשַׁב, קָשַׁב, √קשׁ, to be hard, rigid, firm, whence also קָשָׁה, קָשָׁא, קָשָׁח, קָסַח, קָסַן; cf. on Isa. xxi. 7),—an acting and reacting of praying and hearing upon one another, the design of which was finally and speedily to procure justice for the orphaned and hard pressed, yea crushed, few, in order that mortal man which is of the earth may no more (בַּל, as in Isa. xiv. 21, and in

[1] *Berachoth*, 31*a*: the man who prays must direct his heart steadfastly towards God (יְכַוֵּן לִבּוֹ לַשָּׁמַיִם).

modern Hebrew בַּל and לְבַל, instead of פֶּן) continue to be terrible. From the parallel conclusion in ix. 20, 21, it follows that אֱנוֹשׁ is not meant of the oppressed, but of the oppressor, and is therefore the subject; in which case מִן־הָאָרֶץ also goes along with it, just as in xvii. 14 we find: people of the world, and in lxxx. 14: the boar of the wood. In Prov. xxx. 14, on the other hand, מֵאָרֶץ belongs to the verb (to devour from off the earth). Here also it might be connected with the verb, מִן being taken as referring to the starting point (cf. cxlviii. 7): from the earth, viz. from thence Titanically bidding defiance to God in heaven (Hoelem). But this feature of Titanic rebellion is not implied in the words; and this interpretation also does away with the significant paronomasia which the combination אֱנוֹשׁ מִן־הָאָרֶץ forms with לְעָרֵץ, the bearing of the tyrant and what he really is being contrasted: a mortal of the earth, *i.e.* a being who, although bearing himself like a god, is nevertheless earthly in his origin and therefore of a transitory and perishable nature. It is not said מִן־הָאֲדָמָה, for the earth is not thought of as the material out of which he is formed, but, as in the Johannine ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, as his ancestral house, his home, his limit; Latin, *ut non amplius terreat homo terrenus.* In the אַל־יֵעֹז אֱנוֹשׁ of ix. 20 a similar paronomasia was already attempted. The Heb. verb עָרַץ signifies both to be terrified (Deut. vii. 21) and to terrify (Isa. ii. 19, 21, xlvii. 12). It does not have the signification "to defy, mutiny, rebel," although after the analogy of the Arab. عرض (to cross one's purpose, to withstand) it might have it. It is connected with عرص, to vibrate, tremble (said *e.g.* of lightning).

PSALM XI.

REFUSAL TO FLEE WHEN IN A SITUATION OF GREAT PERIL.

1 In Jahve put I my trust—how say ye to my soul:
"Flee to your mountain, a bird!
2 For lo! the wicked bend the bow,
They have made ready their arrow upon the string,
To shoot in darkness at the upright in heart.
3 If the pillars are thrown down,
The righteous—what can he do?"

4 Jahve in His holy temple,
Jahve, He hath His throne in heaven—
His eyes behold, His eyelids try the children of men.
5 As for Jahve, He proveth the righteous,
And the wicked and those that love violence His soul hateth.
6 May He rain snares upon the wicked,
May fire, brimstone and a burning wind be the portion of their cup!

7 For Jahve is righteous, loving righteous deeds
The upright shall behold His face.

Psalm x. is followed by Ps. xi., which likewise confides in Jahve's all-seeing eyes in opposition to the ungodly who carry out their murderous designs in the dark. The life of David (to whom even Hitzig and Ewald assign this Psalm) is threatened, the pillars of the state are shaken, men counsel the king to flee to the mountains—notes of the time when Absalom's revolution was preparing in secret, but was already clearly discernible. Although hurrying on with rapid movement and clear in its leading thoughts, this Psalm is nevertheless not without difficulties, like almost all the Psalms that contain such dark pictures of the internal condition of Israel; the gloominess of the situation is reflected as it were in the language. The strophic plan is not at once discernible; we shall not, however, be far wrong, if we divide the Psalm into two strophes of seven lines with a two line epiphony.

Vers. 1–3. David rejects the counsel of his friends to save his life by flight. Hidden in Jahve (xvi. 1, xxxvi. 8), he needs no other refuge. However well-meant and well-grounded the counsel is—he finds it too timid and sees himself raised in God above the necessity of following it. In other Psalms also that belong to the time when he was persecuted by Absalom, David introduces his friends as speaking (iii. 3, iv. 7). Their despondency, which he had afterwards to reprove and from which he had to revive them, showed itself, as we see here, even while the storm-cloud was gathering. With "how may or can you say" he rejects their proposal and makes it a reproach against them. If with the *Chethîb* we read נודו, it is men who are well-affected towards David, though not among the number of his immediate followers, that say to him (addressing their words also to his faithful adherents that are most intimately associated with him): escape to your mountain, (ye) birds (צִפּוֹר used collectively, as in viii. 9, cxlviii. 10), or, seeing that such language, which sounds derisively, is not appropriate when put into the mouth of those who are speaking here: like birds (*comparatio decurtata*, as in xxii. 14, lviii. 9; Job xxiv. 5; Isa. xxi. 8). הַרְכֶם, which occasions less difficulty if we take צפור to be a vocative (cf. Isa. xviii. 6 with Ezek xxxix. 4), may be explained, even when we take the latter comparatively, as a retrospective glance at the time when he was persecuted by Saul: to the mountain, which in earlier days protected you effectually (cf. 1 Sam. xxvi. 20, xxiii. 14); still the reading, הר כמו צפור (הר, *in montem*, Deut. xxxiii. 19), which the LXX., Aq., Targ., Syr., and Jerome follow, offers a natural and obvious smoothening. Instead of נודו, which is rendered by all the old versions, the *Kerî* suggests נוּדִי (cf. שְׁחִי, Isa. li. 23), as an address to the soul, the comparison of which to a bird was familiar to the punctuators.[1] If we

[1] On the Talmudic phrase צפור נפשו, his "soul-bird," *vid.* Derenburg in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, vi. 292–294.

adopt this reading, there is no need to take צִפּוֹר, the gender of which is common, as vocative: flee to your mountain, O bird (Hitz.), so that the soul is directly called צִפּוֹר; but it is better to take it as a comparative nominative of the predicate: flee to your mountain (which in former days afforded you a retreat), a bird, *i.e.* after the manner of a bird, which, when chased in the valley, betakes itself to the wooded mountain. But this *Kerî* gets rid of the נודו, which is strange as coming after לְנַפְשִׁי, by putting another *synallage numeri* in the place of this one.[1]

In *v.* 2 the fainthearted justify their counsel by pointing to the peril to which his life is exposed by crafty foes. As הִנֵּה implies, this peril is obvious. The *perfect* represents it as still more imminent than the *impf.*: they are not only already in the act of bending the bow, they have made ready their arrow upon the string (יִתַּר=מֵיתַר in xxi. 13; Arab. *watar* from יָתַר, *watara*, to strain tight, to stretch, so that what is stretched is continued in a straight line) *i.e.* they are already aiming their deadly weapon, in order to discharge it in the dark, *i.e.* after the manner of assassins, at the upright (who as such are odious to them). יָרָה is connected with לְ of the aim, as in 2 Chron. xxxv. 23 (elsewhere with the accusative of the object, lxiv. 5; Num. xxi. 30); בְּמוֹ (which occurs five times before monosyllabic and four times before polysyllabic words) is equivalent to בְּמָה (עַל); the "what" follows, more exactly specified, immediately after.

[1] According to the interpretation given above: "flee to your mountain, a bird," it should be accented נוּדוּ הרכם צִפּוֹר (as a transformation from נְוּדוּ הֹרְכֵם צִפּוֹר; *vid.* Baer's *Accentuationssystem*, xviii. 2); the present interpunction, נֹוּדוּ הרכם צִפּוֹר, gives the meaning brought out by Varenius as well as by Löb Spira (in his commentary on the Pentateuch, which is full of appropriate remarks—Altona, 1815): *Fugite (o socii Davidis), mons vester* (i.e. *præsidium vestrum*, Ps. xxx. 8, *cui innitimini*) *est avis errans.* Cf. S. D. Luzzatto in the Magazine *Biccure ha-Ittim*, viii. 191.

In *v.* 3 the fainthearted still further justify their counsel by pointing to the total confusion into which the administration of justice has at present fallen. הַיְשָׁתוֹת are either, after Isa. xix. 10, the highest ranks, who uphold the edifice of the state, or after lxxxii. 5, Ex. xxx. 4, the foundations of the state, upon which the administration of justice and the well-being of the land depend. We prefer the latter interpretation, seeing that the king and his faithful followers, who are thought of in צַדִּיק, are here contrasted with the יְשָׁתוֹת. The clause with כִּי is formed like Job xxxviii. 41. The *impf.* has a present signification; the *perf.* in the principal clause corresponds, as frequently elsewhere in interrogative clauses (*e.g.* xxxix. 8, lx. ii; Gen. xxi. 7; Num. xxiii. 10; Job xii. 9; 2 Kings xx. 9; Jer. xxx. 21), to the Latin conjunctive (here *quid fecerit*), and must be expressed in our language with the assistance of auxiliary verbs: if the foundations of the state were destroyed, what could the righteous do; he can accomplish nothing. And seeing that all counter-action is vain, the further one is away from the scene of danger the better.

Vers. 4–6. The discourse of the counsellors who are afraid for David is now ended. He justifies the confidence in God with which he began his hymn. Above all that takes place upon earth, and disheartens those who are of little faith, Jahve is enthroned. At an infinite distance above the earth, and also above Jerusalem, which is now in a state of rebellion, there is a הֵיכַל קָדְשׁוֹ (xviii. 7, xxix. 9), and in this holy temple is Jahve, the all-holy One. Above the earth are the heavens, and in heaven stands the throne of Jahve, the King of kings. And this heavenly temple, this heavenly palace, is the place whence comes the ultimate decision of all earthly things (Hab. ii. 20; Mic. i. 2). For the royal throne there is also the super-mundane judgment seat (ix. 8, ciii. 19). Jahve who sits thereon is the all-seeing and all-knowing One. חָזָה, properly to split, divide (cf. *cernere*), here, in accordance with its root-idea, said of a keen penetrating glance; בָּחַן,

properly to try metals by fire, said here of a fixed, deep glance that discerns as it were the very basis and inmost nature of that to which it is directed. The eyelashes are mentioned purposely. When we observe closely or meditate, we bring the eye-lids near to one another, in order that our glance may become one ray of light that is so much the more concentrated and direct, and that, as it were, pierces through the object. Thus men, righteous and unrighteous, lie open to the eyes of Jahve, which see through everything, and to His glances, which search everything through and through. He tries the righteous, *i.e.*, seeing into the depths of his soul, He recognizes that his inmost nature is righteous and able to stand the test (xvii. 3; Job xxiii. 10), and therefore He lovingly protects him, just as the righteous lovingly adheres to Him. The wicked, however, and him that loves the violence done by the stronger to those who are weaker, His soul hates, *i.e.* He hates him with all the energy of His holy nature. The more intense this hatred is, so much the more fearful will be the judgments in which it discharges itself. To take the *jussive impf.* יִמְטֹר as expressive of a wish no doubt seems to be opposed to *v.* 7, which presupposes a declaration regarding something that is imminent; still it is not probable that יִמְטֹר should here have an indicative meaning and יִכְרֹת in the companion Psalm (xii. 4) be optative; and moreover its position at the beginning of the clause is suggestive of the latter rather than of the former sense. Accordingly *v.* 6 desires that the punishment so richly deserved may come upon them, and *v.* 7 grounds this wish upon the righteousness of God. Even assuming that פַּחִים might be equivalent to פַּחֲמִים, still, according to the usage of the language, the Hebrew פֶּחָם, as distinguished from גַּחֶלֶת, does not mean burning coals, but black coals. It ought therefore to have been פַּחֲמֵי אֵשׁ. Hitzig reads פַּחִים from פִּיחַ, ashes; but a shower of ashes is no means of punishment. Böttcher, following Ex. xxxix. 3, Num. xvii. 3, translates it

"clubs"; but in these passages the word means thin plates. We adhere to the meaning, "snares" (Job xxii. 10; cf. xxi. 17; Prov. xxii. 5), and, following the accentuation, understand by these a special means of punishment by itself. The first means of punishment employed is this, that there comes down a whole discharge of lassoes, which render all attempts at flight impossible, viz. lightnings; for the lightning that flashes from one point of the heavens and darts with a serpentine motion towards another may really be compared to a snare or noose that is thrown down from above. Besides the fire and brimstone mentioned in Gen. xix. 24, רוּחַ זְלָעָפוֹת is also added. The LXX. translates it: *πνεῦμα καταιγίδος*, and the Targum: זַעֲפָא עֲלְעוּלָא, *procella turbinea*. The stem is not לעף (which cannot be shown to exist as a cognate form of להב, לאב, to burn), but זעף, which, as Lam. v. 10 shows, corresponds exactly to the Latin *æstuare*, which combines in itself the notions of heat and of violent movement. We must therefore translate it somewhat after this manner: a wind of flames, *i.e.* a pestilential simoom, which, when taken along with אֵשׁ וְגָפְרִית according to the present way of dividing the verse, is represented as a breath of the divine wrath (Isa. xxx. 33) pouring itself forth like a stream of brimstone. This explains also how this can be called the portion of their cup, *i.e.* that which is allotted to them as the contents of the cup that they must drain off. מְנָת (found only in Davidic Psalms, with the exception of Jer. xiii. 25, where according to Kimchi, *Michlol*, 15 *b*, not מְנַת, but מְנָת, is to be written, and 2 Chron. xxxi. 4) is, like the Syr. ܡܢܬ, contracted from מְנָיַת (מְנָוַת), *manajat* (*manawat*), from מָנָה, the primary form being מָנַו, מָנַי. מְנָיַת is of the same form as רְוָיָה, which is not contracted and has the later fem. termination. In מְנָת (just as in קְצָת, from קְצָוַת) the unchangeably long vowel compensates for the loss of the third letter of the stem (*vid.* Hupf. and Olsh., § 108 *c*, 165 *i*). Cf. such forms as עְשָׂת (Lev. xxv. 21) from *âsajat*.

Vers. 7. Thus then Jahve is in alliance with David. Although he cannot defend himself against his foes, yet when Jahve gives free scope to His hatred in judgment, these will have to do with the unavoidable powers of wrath and death. The concluding distich grounds this different bearing of God towards the righteous and the unrighteous and this dismal fate of the latter upon God's righteousness. Just as Jahve Himself is righteous, so also both on His own part (1 Sam. xii. 7, Mic. vi. 5 and freq.) and on the part of man (Isa. xxxiii. 15) He loves צְדָקוֹת, deeds of righteousness. The object of אֹהֵב = אָהֵב precedes it, as in xcix. 4 (cf. x. 14). As in xlvii. 5, lxxviii. 68, אָהֵב, however, might also be finite, having the *ē* that is characteristic of forms expressive of an affection of the mind, and that always indicates a *talem esse*, a ἕξις, even when such verbs are used transitively. The question whether יָשָׁר in *v.* 7 *b* is subject or object is much more important. A predicate in the plural may follow a subject in the singular (cf. ix. 7; Job viii. 19) as well as precede it (Prov. xxviii. 1, Isa. xvi. 4). No doubt that which would most readily occur to one would be to take יָשָׁר as object. Taken by themselves the words may mean: "His countenance beholds the upright one" (Hengst. and others) as well as: "upright ones behold His countenance." Nevertheless weighty reasons require that we take יָשָׁר as subject. For (1) the usage of the language always speaks of the face as being something only to be seen, not seeing; if the poet had meant יָשָׁר to be the object of the verb, he would have said עיניהמו (xxxiii. 18, xxxiv. 16, Job xxxvi. 7). (2) If יָשָׁר be object, the thought which the sentence expresses is already expressed in *v.* 5 *a*. (3) The thought, that such as are upright behold the face of God, is a thought that finds parallels in xvii. 15, cxl. 13, whereas the thought that the face of God beholds the upright man is, when expressed in this way, without a parallel. (4) At the close of the Psalm one expects to find a statement regarding the end of the upright as con-

trasted with that of the godless. We may conclude therefore that the poet meant to say: upright men (*quisquis probus est*) shall behold His countenance. The pathetic פָּנֵימוֹ instead of פָּנָיו was specially suitable here, seeing it is a closing word that refers to God. Now that the Phœnician לם, = לוֹ (mimation of the contracted *lahu*), is unquestioned,[1] it is more certain that *mo* is occasionally (*e.g.* Job xx. 23; cf. xxii. 2, xxvii. 23) a singular suffix. Mortal man cannot behold God's countenance and live. When, however, God causes His countenance to shine (Num. vi. 25), *i.e.* reveals Himself in love, He makes the creature able to bear the sight. To enjoy this vision of God, this vision which is softened by love, is the highest honour which God in His grace can bestow upon a man; it is the very blessedness reserved for the upright (cxl. 13). It cannot be said that what is meant is a vision of God beyond the grave: but just as little can it be said that it is exclusively a vision on this side of it. To the Old Testament consciousness the future עולם undoubtedly loses itself in the night of Sheôl. Faith, however, broke through this night and trusted in a future intuition of God (Job xix. 26). The New Testament redemption has realised this postulate of faith, inasmuch as the Redeemer, having broken through the night of the realm of the dead, has led up the saints of the Old Testament along with Himself, and has translated them into the sphere of the divine love that is clearly revealed in heaven.

PSALM XII.

COMPLAINT AND CONSOLATION IN THE MIDST OF PREVAILING FALSEHOOD.

2 Help, Jahve, for the godly man is no more,
For the faithful have vanished from among the children of men!

[1] On the origin of this לם (למו) *vid.* Philippi, *Status Constr.*, p. 189, and Stade in *Morgenländische Forschungen* (1875), pp. 202 ff.

3 They speak falsehood every one with his neighbour,
A flattering lip with a double heart do they speak.

4 May Jahve cut off all flattering lips,
The tongue that speaketh so grandiloquently,
5 That say: to our tongue do we impart strength,
Our lips are with us; who is lord over us?

6 "Because of the oppression of the afflicted, the groaning of the poor,
Now will I arise—saith Jahve—
In safety will I set him that panteth for it."—
7 The words of Jahve are pure words,
Silver smelted down in the furnace to the ground,
Refined seven times.

8 Thou, O Jahve, wilt guard them,
Thou wilt preserve him from this generation for ever.
9 The wicked strut about on every side,
When vileness is exalted among the children of men.

Ps. xi. is appropriately followed by Ps. xii. the purport of the two being similar. The latter is a prayer for the deliverance of the miserable and the poor in a time of universal moral corruption, and more particularly of prevailing faithlessness and boasting. The title: *For the Musician, on the Octave, a Psalm of David*, refers us to the time when the temple-music was being established, the time of David—incomparably the best age in Israel's history, and yet, when looked at in the light of the spirit of holiness, an age that was so radically corrupt. The true Church of Jahve was even then, as always, a Church of confessors and martyrs; and the sighing for the coming of Jahve was in these days not less deep than the present sighing, "Come, Lord Jesus!"

Along with Ps. ii. this Ps. xii. is a second example of the manner in which a psalmist, when in a state of spiritual excitement, passes over into the tone of a prophet who directly hears God's word and is therefore inspired. Just as lyric poetry, as being a direct and solemn expression of mental agitation, is generally speaking the oldest kind of poetry, so psalm-poetry not only preformatively contains in itself the

Maschal, the epic and the drama; but even prophecy, as we possess it in the prophetical writings of its best period, is born, as it were, from its womb; it is throughout a blending of future epic and subjective lyric elements, and in many respects the echo of earlier Psalms; and in many places (*e.g.* Isa. xii.; Hab. iii.) it even passes over into the strain of psalmody. Hence Asaph receives the epithet הַחֹזֶה (2 Chron. xxix. 30)—not on account of the special character of his Psalms, but simply as a psalmodist, for the same name is given to Jeduthun in 2 Chron. xxxv. 15; and in 1 Chron. xxv. 2*f* even נִבָּא (cf. *προφητεύειν* in Luke i. 67) is used as a designation of psalm-singing with musical accompaniment—a clear proof that the co-operation of a human factor is no less to be recognized in prophecy than the influence of a divine factor in psalm-poetry.

Direct words of Jahve and the Amen of the psalmist to them form the middle portion of this Psalm—a strophe of six lines, which is surrounded by strophes of four lines.

Vers. 2, 3. The sigh of prayer, הוֹשִׁיעָה, implies its object in itself: work deliverance, afford assistance, and is accounted for by the following complaint. The verb גָּמַר, to complete, means here, as in vii. 10, to come to an end, to be no more, and the ἅπ. λεγ. פָּסַס is equivalent to אָפַס in lxxvii. 9, to come to the worst, to cease. That אֱמוּנִים is not here an abstract noun (as *e.g.* in Prov. xiii. 17) is already plain from the predicate that precedes it in the plural; the parallelism, the same as in xxxi. 24, is also against our so taking it. חָסִיד is the godly man, one who practises חֶסֶד towards God and man. אֱמוּן, ground-form אֱמִין (*plur.* אֱמוּנִים; according to others from אָמַן, with the same initial vowel sound as עָרוּךְ in Joel ii. 5; cf. אֱמֶת = אֱמַנְתָּ), used here as an adjective (as in xxxi. 24; 2 Sam. xx. 19; cf. on the other hand Deut. xxxii. 20), is the man who is trustworthy, faithful, conscientious, literally the man who is firm, *i.e.* the man whose mind and word are constant, so that one can rely upon them and

be certain with regard to him. We read similar complaints regarding the universal prevalence of wickedness in Mic. vii. 2, Isa. lvii. 1, Jer. vii. 28 and elsewhere. Such complaints imply their own limitation. For although those who thus complain will, without Pharisaic self-justification, accuse themselves of participating in the prevailing corruption, they are nevertheless in their penitence, their sufferings for the faith, and their cry for help, an actual proof that humanity has not yet become without exception a *massa perdita*. What the author specially complains of is the prevailing untruthfulness. Men speak שָׁוְא (=שָׁוְאָ, from שׁוּא), dissoluteness and hollowness under a specious disguise, falsehood (xli. 7) and hypocrisy (Job xxxv. 13), ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ (LXX.; cf. Eph. iv. 25, where the greatness of this sin is based upon the New Testament principle: ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη); they speak a lip of smoothnesses (חֲלָקוֹת, plur. of חֲלָקָה, *lævitates*, or of חָלָק, *lævia*), *i.e.* the smoothest and most polished language (accusative of the object as in Isa. xix. 18), with a double heart, inasmuch, viz., as the sentiment with which they deceitfully impose upon others and perhaps even upon themselves is different from that which they actually cherish, or even (cf. 1 Chron. xii. 33, בלא לב ולב, and Jas. i. 8, δίψυχος, fickle, inconstant) inasmuch as the sentiment they now express in flattering terms quickly changes into the very opposite.

Vers. 4, 5. The optative signification of the *jussive* יַכְרֵת is as unquestionable here as in cix. 15. Flattering lips and a grandiloquent tongue are in so far compatible, as the braggart, when it serves his own self-interest, becomes a flatterer. אֲשֶׁר refers to lips and tongue, which, however, are meant of those who possess them. The *Hiph.* הַגְבִּיר can only mean either to impart strength or to evince strength; the fact that it is combined with לְ instead of with בְּ is in favour of the former: we will give emphasis to our tongue; such is the self-confident declaration of their will. Contrary to the

signification of the *Hiphil*, Hupfeld renders it: we are masters of our tongue; while Ewald and Olshausen, on the ground of an erroneous interpretation of Dan. ix. 27, render it: with our tongue we make or have a firm covenant. They characterise their lips as their confederates (אֵת as in 2 Kings ix. 32), and with "who is Lord over us" they declare themselves to be absolutely free and exalted above authority of every kind. If any authority should endeavour to assert itself over them, their mouth strikes it to the ground, their tongue beats it down. But Jahve, whom this deification of themselves challenges, will not always suffer His own to be thus enslaved.

Vers. 6, 7. In *v.* 6 the psalmist hears Jahve Himself speak, and in *v.* 7 he says Amen to what He says. The two מִן of *v.* 6 indicate the reason, עַתָּה the decisive turning-point from forbearance to the infliction of punishment, and יֹאמַר the divine determination, which is just now causing itself to be heard; cf. the echo in Isa. xxxiii. 10. Up to this time Jahve has apparently looked on inactively and with indifference; now He will arise and set into יְשֻׁעָה, *i.e.* the condition of safety (cf. שִׂים בַּחַיִּים, lxvi. 9), him that panteth thereafter. We must not interpret it: him at whom he, the boaster, puffs, which would be יָפִיחַ בּוֹ (cf. x. 5), but with Ew., Hengst., Olsh., and Böttch., after Hab. ii. 3, where יָפִיחַ לְ occurs in the sense of panting or hasting towards an end: him who yearns for it. יָפִיחַ, however, is not a participial adjective = יָפֵחַ, but an *impf.* (*vid.* König, *Lehrgeb.* p. 504), and יָפִיחַ לוֹ is therefore a relative clause taking the place of the object, such a clause as occurs in Job xxiv. 19, Isa. xli. 2, 25 and in many other passages. Hupfeld's rendering: "in order that he may recover breath (*respiret*)" leaves אֲשִׁית without an object, and is in accordance with Aramaic and Arabic rather than with Hebrew usage, which would express this by means of יָנוּחַ לוֹ or יָרוּחַ לוֹ. In *v.* 7 this proclamation by Jahve is followed by its echo from the heart of the seer:

the words (אֲמָרוֹת instead of אִמְרוֹת according to Ben-Ascher's rule[1]) of Jahve are pure words, *i.e.* they are absolutely without any intermixture of untruthfulness, and are meant and fulfilled in their natural sense. The poetical אִמְרָה (after the form זִמְרָה) serves especially as the designation of the divine words of promise which are so full of power. The figure, which is hinted at elsewhere, when God's word is called צְרוּפָה (xviii. 31, cxix. 140, Prov. xxx. 5), is worked out here: silver that is melted and therefore refined בְּעֲלִיל לָאָרֶץ. עֲלִיל is either derived from עָלַל, عَلَّ, *immitere*, whence also עוֹל (*vid.* Fleischer on Isa. iii. 4), and signifies "the crucible" (Targ., Jefeth, Luth.); or (and seeing that for "crucible" the language has the terms כּוּר and מַצְרֵף, this is more probable) it is derived from עָלַל, عَلَّ, *operari* (properly to set about anything), and signifies primarily that which is being worked at (after the form מְעִיל, פְּסִיל, שְׁבִיל), then the place where the work is carried on, workshop. From the same root comes also the Talmudic בְּגָלוּי = בְּעֲלִיל, *manifeste*, a term which occurs in the Mischna *Rosch-ha-Schana*, i. 5, and elsewhere, the primary meaning of which answers to the French *en effet*. Accordingly, the ל of לָאָרֶץ is not that of appurtenance: in a crucible which is embedded in the earth,—for which לארץ, moreover, would be an inadequate and colourless expression; but in keeping with the usual meaning of לארץ when employed as an adverbial adjunct, we must render it: smelted (refined) down to the ground. Olshausen remarks upon this passage, "Silver, which, when purified in the furnace, flows down to the ground, one may see in every foundry; the pure smelted silver flows down out of the smelting fur-

[1] If a guttural follows the consonant that is pointed with *Schebâ*, Ben-Ascher substitutes *Schebâ compositum* for the simple *Schebâ* (*e.g.* לְשֵׁאוֹל, xlix. 15), and if the *Schebâ* is silent, *i.e.* if the consonant under which it is placed ends the syllable, he is so fond of making the syllable half open that he writes אֶאֱרָא, xviii. 7, תְּכַהֵין lxviii. 24, and the like. *Vid.* his rule with its exceptions in Baer, *Thorath Emeth*, p. 27.

nace, in which the ore is heaped up." For, seeing that אֶרֶץ does not denote the earth as material, and therefore cannot mean earthen elements, it cannot be the ל of reference ("refined with respect to the earth"), unless we were to read לְאֶבֶן, which would not mean "to a white brilliancy," *i.e.* so as to become a pure bright mass (Böttch.), but "as regards the *stannum*, the galena" (*vid.* on Isa. i. 25). The verb זָקַק corresponds to the German *seihen*, *seigen*, Old High German *sîhan*, Greek σακκεῖν (σακκίζειν), to strain, filter, cause to percolate, to purify by passing through a cloth used as a strainer, שֵׂק. God's word is pure silver that has flown off and left all dross behind it, silver that has as it were passed seven times through the furnace, and is therefore altogether free of alloy and very precious. Silver is an emblem of everything that is precious and pure, and seven is the number of the completed process.

Vers. 8, 9. In the second strophe the supplicating complaint of the first has passed over into an ardent wish; on the ground of the divine word, which was heard in the third, there now arises in the fourth an assured hope. The suffix *ēm* in 8 *a* refers back to the helpless and the poor, the suffix *ennu* in 8 *b* (him, not: us, in which case it must have been punctuated תִּצְּרֵנוּ) to those who are represented in the divine word (*v.* 6) as yearning for safety. The *synallage* is harsh; but a similar *synallage* occurs so frequently in the Psalms and the prophets, that we must hesitate to get rid of it with Baethgen (*Stud. u. Kritik.* 1880, p. 752 *f.*) by correcting the text. Preservation for ever is a preservation so enduring, that they will never succumb to this generation. The oppression shall not become a thorough crushing, the temptation shall not go beyond their power of enduring it. That which follows in *v.* 9 is not a concessive clause: even although the wicked should walk on every side (Riehm); for there is no "even" (גַּם, Ew., § 362 *b*) in the text, and both the collocation of the words and the emphatic form of the

impf. are opposed to this syntactical concatenation. It is a direct statement giving a more particular description of the depraved generation mentioned in 8 *b*. דּוֹר is the generation which has on the whole one general character and renders homage to one *Zeitgeist* (cf. *e.g.* Prov. xxx. 11–14, where the characteristic features of a corrupt age are specified); זוּ (always without the article, Ew., § 293 *a*) points to the present time and the present customs, which are finally once more characterized in a few outlines of a more general kind than in *vv.* 3–5. Wicked men stalk about on every side (הִתְהַלֵּךְ, said of an easy, conceited, swaggering gait), when (because) vileness is so exalted (רוּם, as in Prov. xi. 11; cf. מָשַׁל, Prov. xxix. 2) among (ל) the children of men that they come to be under its dominion. Mendelssohn, following the Targum, translates: when vileness breeds like vermin. The figure is a Semitic one; in Arabic also "to increase as vermin increase" (كما ينمى الدود) is equivalent to "to multiply greatly"; but רָמַם, רמّ, if used in this sense (Ex. xvi. 20), would not stand thus alone by itself; and the *defect. script.* does not warrant us to look upon this unlikely word as intended here instead of רוּם, which is thoroughly in keeping with the context. Vileness is called זְלוּת, *vilitas*, from זָלַל (cogn. דָּלַל), to be supple and flaccid, base, mean, worthless. Like the Talmudic זילוּת (זִלִּיל = זִיל), the form is passive; it is the designation of that which is depreciated, despised and which ought to be despised; here it is the antithesis of the disposition and way of acting of the noble man, נָדִיב (Isa. xxxii. 8), the vileness which is destitute not only of all nobler principles and motives, but also of all nobler impulses and paroxysms. The בְּ of כְּרֹם is not, as *e.g.* in Prov. x. 25, an expression of simultaneousness: as soon as vileness is exalted—for in that case *v.* 9 would state a general observation instead of being descriptive, but כְּרֹם is equivalent to כֶּרֶם, and is used intentionally instead of the latter, in order to give

expression to a coincidence that is not merely accidental but based upon an intimate relation of cause and effect. Wicked men strut about everywhere, surrounding the better on every side in a hostile spirit. So it is; and it cannot be otherwise at a time, when men allow vileness to obtain dominion over and among them, as is just now the case. Thus even at the last, and while the psalmist is avowing his assured hope, the depressing view of the present asserts itself. The present is gloomy. But in the hexastich of the middle of the Psalm the future is lighted up as a source of consolation against this gloominess.

PSALM XIII.

SUPPLIANT CRY OF ONE WHO HAS ALMOST SUCCUMBED.

2 How long, Jahve! dost Thou forget me for ever,
How long hidest Thou Thy face from me?
3 How long shall I cherish anxiety in my soul,
Sorrow in my heart by day?
How long shall my foe be exalted over me?

4 Look hither, answer me, Jahve my God,
Lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep unto death,
5 Lest my foe say: "I have overcome him,"
And my oppressors exult when I stumble.

6 But as for me, in Thy grace do I trust;
Let my heart exult in Thy salvation;
I will sing of Jahve that He hath dealt bountifully with me.

The יָרוּם of the personal lamentation, which David raises in Ps. xiii., harmonises with the כֶּרֶם of the general complaint, which he makes in Ps. xii.; and for this reason the compiler has coupled these two Psalms together. Hitzig assigns Ps. xiii. to the time when Saul was hunting David down as if he were really a beast of prey, and when the latter, having already been long and unceasingly pursued, dared cherish the hope of escaping death only by unwearied

endurance and activity. Hitzig is perhaps right. The Psalm consists of three strophes, or, if one prefers so to put it, of three groups of decreasing magnitude. A long deep sigh is followed by a petition that is already gentler and half tranquillized, and which proceeds as it were from a relieved breast; and this is followed by believing joy in the certainty of being heard. The hymn as it were advances in waves that are constantly decreasing in length, until at last it is only agitated with joy, and becomes calm as the sea when smooth as a mirror.

Vers. 2, 3. The complicated question: till when, how long . . . for ever (as in lxxiv. 10, lxxix. 5, lxxxix. 47), is the expression of a complicated condition of soul, where, as Luther briefly and appropriately describes it, in the anguish caused by the apprehension of divine wrath "hope itself despairs, and despair nevertheless hopes." The self-contradiction of the question is to be explained by the conflict between the spirit and the flesh that is raging within. The desponding heart thinks: God has forgotten me for ever; but the spirit repels this thought and turns it into a question, which marks this forsaking as being only apparent: how long shall it seem that Thou forgettest me for ever? It lies in the very nature of the divine wrath that the feeling of it is always accompanied by the impression of its eternity and, therefore, by a foretaste of hell. Faith, however, holds fast the love that is behind the wrath, sees in the display of wrath only a self-disguising of the loving countenance of the God of love, and earnestly desires that this loving countenance may once more be unveiled to it. Four times does David raise this cry of faith from the very depths of his spirit. To put or set up devices, plans, schemes in his soul, viz. as to how he may be able to escape from this agonising condition, is equivalent to: to make the soul the place, the laboratory of such projects (cf. Prov. xxvi. 24); one such עֵצָה pursues the other in his soul,

because he recognises the vanity of the one after the other as soon as they occur to his mind. In view of the following יוֹמָם we must think of anxiety that he felt by night; for night leaves man alone with his affliction and makes him feel it doubly keen. It cannot be proved from Ezek. xxx. 16 (cf. Zeph. ii. 4, בַּצָּהֳרַיִם) that יוֹמָם, like יוֹם (Jer. vii. 25, shortly for יום יום), may mean daily (Ew., § 313 *a*); nor does it have that meaning here, but it is the antithesis of the לַיְלָה, which is to be supplied in thought in 3 *a*. By night he devises plan after plan, each one as vain as the other; by day, or all the day, when he sees his distress with open eyes, sorrow (יָגוֹן) is in his heart, the precipitate, as it were, of the night, and a direct reflexion of his helpless and hopeless condition. He is pursued, and his foe is in the ascendant. רוּם means both to be exalted and to raise one's self up, *i.e.* to come to the front and to give one's self airs. The group of verses closes with *quousque*, repeated for the fourth time.

Vers. 4, 5. In contrast to God's seeming to have forgotten him and to be desirous to see and know nothing regarding his need, he entreats: הַבִּיטָה (cf. Isa. lxiii. 15); in contrast to his being perplexed and unable to help himself, he prays: עֲנֵנִי, answer (reply to) me, who am crying for help, viz. with such a fulfilment of my prayer as will manifestly be a real answer; and in contrast to the triumphing of his foe: הָאִירָה עֵינָי, in order that the triumph of his foe may not be made complete by his dying. To enlighten the eyes that are dimmed with trouble and well nigh closing in death, is equivalent to: to impart new vital force (Ezra ix. 8), of which the fresh, clear brightness of the eye is the reflection (1 Sam. xiv. 27, 29). The illuminating light, to which הֵאִיר points, is the loving light of the divine countenance (xxxi. 17). Light, love, life and their opposites, darkness, wrath, death, are ideas closely linked together in Scripture. He whom God looks upon in love continues to

live; new vital powers permeate him; he does not have to sleep death, *i.e.* the sleep of death (Jer. li. 39, 57; cf. Ps. lxxvi. 6). הַמָּוֶת is the accusative of the effect or consequence: to sleep so that the sleep becomes death (LXX., εἰς θάνατον. Cf. Ew., § 281 *c*). For such a light of life he prays, in order that his foe may not ultimately be able to say יְכָלְתִּיו (with accusative object as in Jer. xxxviii. 5) = יְכֹלְתִּי לוֹ (cxxix. 2, Gen. xxxii. 26), I am able for him, I am become superior to him. On account of the following *impf.* it is better to take כִּי as referring to time (*quum*) than as indicating the reason (*quod*); cf. בְּמוֹט רַגְלִי (xxxviii. 17).

Ver. 6. The five lines of lamentation and the four of supplication are now followed by three of joyous anticipation. With וַאֲנִי he sets himself over against his foes: these desire his death; he, however, trusts in God's grace, which will turn and put an end to his misery. בָּטַח בְּ characterises faith as confidence that clings fast to God, just as חָסָה בְּ characterises it as confidence that hides itself in Him. The voluntative יָגֵל presupposes the certainty of the hope. The *perf.* in 6 *c* is to be understood literally; his lauding of Jahve follows the fact that inspires his song. גָּמַל עַל, to do good to, to benefit, as in cxvi. 7, cxix. 17; cf. (עַל) גָּמַר, lvii. 3, which is from a kindred root. With the two iambics *gamál álâj* the hymn subsides to rest. In the stormily agitated soul of the suppliant all has now become calm. Although the storm may still continue to rage without, there is peace in the depths of his heart.

PSALM XIV.

THE PREVAILING CORRUPTION AND THE LONGED-FOR REDEMPTION.

1 The fool saith in his heart: "there is no God."
Corrupt, abominable is their behaviour,
There is no one that doeth good.

2 Jahve looketh down from heaven upon the children of men,
To see if there be any that have discernment,
If there be such as enquire after God.

3 They have all fallen away, they are one and all corrupt,
There is no one that doeth good,
There is not even one.

4 "Are they so utterly devoid of understanding, all the workers of iniquity,
Who, eating up My people, eat up bread,
And upon Jahve do not call?"

5 Then they shudder indeed,
For God is in the righteous generation.

6 The purpose of the afflicted ye would put to shame,
For Jahve is indeed his refuge!

7 Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion!
When Jahve turneth the captivity of His people,
Jacob shall exult, Israel shall be glad.

Just as the general lamentation of Ps. xii. became personal in Ps. xiii., so in Ps. xiv. it again becomes general; and the longing that is expressed in xiv. 7 (יָגֵל יַעֲקֹב) with regard to the whole people of God corresponds to the personal hopeful longing of xiii. 6 (יָגֵל לִבִּי). In other respects Ps. xiv., as being a gloomy picture of the time with the dawn of the divine day in the background, is more closely connected with Ps. xii. than with Ps. xiii.; although there must have been some good reason for inserting the latter between these two. In the sentence of reprobation that is pronounced upon the ethico-religious condition of the men of the present generation, and which Ps. xiv. has in common with Ps. xii., we have also a confirmation of the לדוד of both; nor does xiv. 7 compel us to date them from the time of the Exile.

Ps. xiv. is Jehovistic; but in Ps. liii. we meet it again in the Elohistic style. From the position of Ps. xiv. in the primary collection, it is natural to presume that it is the earlier in respect of origin and the more original as regards its form. When we compare the two critically, this pre-

sumption is verified; and we shall therefore take no notice of Ps. liii. here, but treat of it in its proper place. Not as if Ps. xiv. were intact. It was evidently meant to consist of seven tristichs; but *vv.* 5 and 6, which should have been the fifth and sixth of these, are only distichs,—the original proportion of the form seems to have been destroyed by some omission. In Ps. liii. this is remedied by combining these two distichs into one tristich; it therefore consists of only six of these. There also the announcement of the judgment is made to refer to a foreign foe, a circumstance which, when allowed to influence the exposition of Ps. xiv., leads it astray.[1]

Ver. 1. As in i. 1, x. 3, the *perf.*, אָמַר, is the so-called abstract present (Ges., § 126, 3), expressive of a fact of universal experience, which is inferred from many individual instances. The language of the Old Testament is uncommonly rich in designations of the unwise. The simple, פֶּתִי, and the silly, כְּסִיל, form the lowest rounds of this ladder; the idiot, אֱוִיל, and the lunatic, הוֹלֵל, the uppermost. In the middle lies the notion of the fool or crack-brained, נָבָל,—a word from the verbal stem נָבַל, which, according as the kernel of the group of consonants lies either in נב or in בל (cf. אבל, אול, אמל, קמל), signifies either to project, to be prominent, *eminere*, Arab. *nabula*, or to distend one's self, to relax, to become decrepit, to wither, so that נָבָל accordingly is the one who is flaccid, impotent (Aquila, *ἀπορρέων*), or in the language of the New Testament: *πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔχοντα*. "A fool"—thus Isa. xxxii. 6 characterizes the נָבָל—"speaks folly and his heart works iniquity, to practise knavery and to utter foolish things against Jahve, to leave empty the soul of the

[1] Bickell (*D.M.Z.*, xxvi. 811) finds in Ps. xiv. the acrostic איה השם, where is God? But in order to bring out such an acrostic, *v.* 6 with its initial ע must be made a member of *v.* 5. The Psalter contains no acrostics. The pursuit after such is a play of wit, which is mistaken and leads astray.

hungry and to refuse drink to the thirsty." According to this, נָבָל is the synonym of לֵץ, scoffer (*vid.* the definition in Prov. xxi. 24). According to the Scriptures such a free-thinker is to be reckoned amongst those who are vapid, hollow, devoid of mind. The thought, אֵין אֱלֹהִים, in which the thinking and acting of such a one is rooted, is the climax of imbecility. It is not merely practical atheism that is meant by this maxim of the נָבָל. According to the Scriptures the heart is the laboratory not only of volition, but also of thought. The נָבָל is not satisfied with acting as if there were no God; but he even directly denies that there is a God, viz. a personal God. That such atheists may be found among men, the Psalmist considers the very extreme and depth of human depravity, and, therefore, makes mention of it first. The subject of what follows is not these deniers of God, but men in general, among whom such are found; they make corrupt, they make abominable (their) way of acting, behaviour. עֲלִילָה, poetically short for עֲלִילוֹתָם, belongs to both verbs, which have *Tarcha Mercha* (the two usual serviles of *Mugrasch*) in correct texts, and that, too, not as an adverbial accusative (Hengst. and others), but as an objective; for הִשְׁחִית is specially fond of this combination with עֲלִילָה (Zeph. iii. 7), or, what is the same thing, with דֶּרֶךְ (Gen. vi. 12), and הִתְעִיב (cf. 1 Kings xxi. 26) is only added to give the greatest possible intensity to הִשְׁחִית. The negation: "there is none that doeth good" is as unlimited as xii. 2. Further on, however, the psalmist distinguishes from the corrupt mass a דּוֹר צַדִּיק, which has to experience this corruption in the form of persecution. He means what he says to be understood of humanity as κόσμος, in which, just as in the divine words in Gen. vi. 5, 12, the little company of those, who have been taken out of the corrupt mass by means of grace, at first escapes his notice. Seeing that it is only grace that delivers from this universal corruption, it may also be said that men are described here as they are by nature; although, it is

true, what is spoken of is not the condition of original sin by itself, but that of actual transgression, which springs up vigorously from the former, if grace does not intervene.

Ver. 2. The second tristich appeals to the infallible judgment of God Himself. The verb הִשְׁקִיף (from שָׁקַף, to bend forward, overhang) means to look out, by bending one's self forward. It is the proper word for looking out of a window (2 Kings ix. 30; cf. the *Niph.* in Judg. v. 28 et freq.) and for God's looking down from heaven upon the earth (cii. 20 and freq.). It is synon. with הִשְׁגִּיחַ (xxxiii. 13, 14; cf. also Cant. ii. 9). The perfect has a perfect sense only so far as the divine survey has preceded the report that is made as to the result in *v.* 3. Just as הִשְׁחִיתוּ (both *Hiphils* with a euphonic *Gaja*) recalls to one's mind the history of the Flood, so לְרָאוֹת recalls the history of the building of the tower of Babel (Gen. xi. 5; cf. xviii. 21). God's judgment rests upon a cognition of the actual state of the case, a cognition which is represented in such passages after the manner of men. God's eyes, which take in everything and pierce through everything, review humanity. Is there one who shows discernment in thinking and in acting, one to whom fellowship with God is the highest good and therefore also that after which he strives?—so enquires God, who has His delight in such, and whose close and yearning search such would certainly not escape. On אֶת־אֱלֹהִים, τὸν Θεόν, *vid.* Ges., § 117, 2.

Ver. 3. The third tristich bemoans the condition in which He finds humanity. The universality of the corruption is expressed in a threefold manner, and, therefore, as emphatically as possible. הַכֹּל (the totality) alternates with יַחְדָּו (literally, in its or their combinations, *i.e. universi*); it is not necessary to alter נאלחו אין into נאלח ואין; the *plur.* is found along with יחדו also in liii. 4, and after 1 Chron. x. 6 may be unhesitatingly accepted. סָר is the 3rd *perf.*, seeing the question is not so much as to conditions as to facts and

the cognition of them; they have all turned aside, viz. from God's way, *i.e.* they have fallen away from God (*ἀποστάτης*). As in Job xv. 16, נָאֱלַח characterizes the moral corruption as a turning sour, becoming putrid, suppuration. Instead of אֵין גַּם־אֶחָד (there is not even one that might form an exception) the LXX. translates: *οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός* (as if it were עַד־אֶחָד, which is the more common form). In Rom. iii. 10–12, Paul quotes the first three verses of this Psalm as a proof that the position he maintains, that Jews and Gentiles are all under sin, is in conformity with the teaching of Scripture. What the psalmist says applies primarily to the Israelites in his immediate neighbourhood; at the same time, however, it applies also to the heathen, as indeed is self-evident; what is lamented is neither the corruption of the pseudo-Israelites in particular, nor that of the heathen, but the universal corruption that is prevalent in Israel no less than in the heathen world. The citations of the Apostle that follow his quotation from this Psalm, from *τάφος ἀνεῳγμένος* to *ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν*, were at a very early period incorporated with the Psalm in the *Κοινή* of the LXX. They appear as an integral portion of that version in *Cod. Vat.* and *Sin.*, also in the Greco-Latin *Psalterium Veronense*, and in the Syriac *Psalterium Mediolanense;* they are also found in Apollinaris' paraphrase of the Psalms as a later interpolation; *Cod. Vat.* 754 has them in the margin; and in the Rabbinical translation: מָוֶת רַע וּפֶגַע רַע בְּדַרְכֵיהֶם, the words: *σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν* have found admittance even into a Hebrew Codex (Kennicott, 649). Origen rightly excluded this apostolic mosaic of Old Testament testimonies from his text of the Psalms; and the true exposition of the state of matters is already found in Jerome, in the preface to book xvi. of his commentary on Isaiah.[1]

[1] Cf. Plüschke, *De Psalterii Syriaci Mediolanensis indole*, 1835 pp. 28–39, and Fred. Field on our passage.

Ver. 4. So utterly cheerless is the result of the divine scrutiny. In Israel at least, the people of the law and of redemption, matters ought to have looked differently. But even there wickedness prevails and frustrates God's gracious will. It is to the sinners among this people that the divine outburst of indignation which is heard here by the psalmist applies. As in Isa. iii. 13–15, the Judge of the world addresses Himself to the leading men of Israel in particular. This one feature of our Psalm has been formed into an independent prophetical picture in the Asaphic Psalm, lxxxii. That which is put here in the form of a question, הֲלֹא יָדְעוּ, is turned there (*v.* 5) into a direct statement. We must not translate it: will they not have to feel it (which ought to have been יֵדְעוּ), nor with Hupfeld: have they not experienced it? "Not to know" is meant here in the signification *non sapere* and, therefore, *insipientem esse*, as absolutely as in lxxxii. 5, lxxiii. 22, xcii. 7, Isa. xliv. 18 (cf. *v.* 9), xlv. 20, and freq. The *perf.* is to be understood after the analogy of *novisse* (Ges., § 126, 6), and we must therefore render it: have all the workers of iniquity attained to no knowledge (Aquila: *μὴ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν*), are they devoid of all knowledge and consequently like brutes, yea, according to Isa. i. 2, 3, inferior to brutes? The two following clauses are, logically at least, attributive clauses. That אֲכְלוּ לֶחֶם should be subordinated to the participle as a circumstantial clause in the sense of בְּאָכְלָ֫ם לֶחֶם, is syntactically inadmissible; but neither may אכלו לחם be understood with Hupfeld of a brutish and secure way of spending one's life; for, as Olshausen rightly observes, אָכַל לֶחֶם does not mean to feast, to gormandize, but simply to eat, to take a meal. It also means to support one's self (Amos vii. 12), according to which signification Riehm renders it: who by eating up my people seek and obtain their means of subsistence. This interpretation is possible; but Hengstenberg's seems to us to be more poetical and also to characterize the workers of iniquity better: who eating my

people eat bread, *i.e.* who no more think they are doing anything sinful than if they were eating bread, but rather think that what they are doing is as justifiable, unquestionable, and competent to them; cf. the working out of this thought in Mic. iii. 1–3 (especially in the latter part of *v.* 3 "as if in the pot and as flesh within the caldron") and Prov. xxx. 14. Instead of לֹא קָרְאוּ ה׳ Jeremiah (x. 21; cf., however, x. 25*f.* and also Ps. lxxix. 6*f.*) says: וְאֶת־ה׳ לֹא דָרָשׁוּ. The meaning is the same as in Hos. vii. 7. They do not pray, as it becomes man who is endowed with spirit to do; they are therefore like cattle, and act like beasts of prey.

Ver. 5. When Jahve thus breaks out into indignation, His word, which is never ineffectual, thunders down those unnatural men, who are devoid of knowledge and conscience. Here, as in lxvi. 6, Hos. ii. 17, Zeph. i. 14, Job. xxiii. 7, xxxv. 12, the local demonstrative שָׁם is used temporally, and, as in xxxvi. 13, it is combined with the perfect of certainty. It does not mean "there, = some day," as if it pointed to an indefinite future, but "there = then," when God shall thus speak to them in His wrath. Here, as frequently in the loftier style (*e.g.* in Hab. iii. 9), the signification of the verb פָּחַד is intensified by the addition of a noun from the same stem, not, as is usually the case, by the addition of the infin. absolute. Then, when God's long-suffering passes over into indignation and wrath, their inmost heart trembles with anguish at the prospect of judgment. On the other hand, however, this judgment of wrath is a revelation of love. Thus Jahve avenges and delivers those whom He calls עַמִּי, who, in contrast to the corrupt humanity of the present time (xii. 8), are conformed to the revealed will of God and held together by a better spirit than the *Zeitgeist*, and are, therefore, here called דּוֹר צַדִּיק,—דּוֹר passing over from the signification *generatio* into that of *genus hominum*, as it always does, when it is used not merely in a temporal sense, but as an ethical term; cf. xxiv. 6, lxxiii. 15, cxii. 2, in each of which it is a

designation of the totality of the children of God who are in bondage in the wicked world and sighing for redemption.

Ver. 6. In consequence of the self-attestation of God in judgment, of which he has become so certain and the assurance of which fills him with such consolation, the psalmist himself confronts his oppressors, full of joyous defiance. Instead of the sixth tristich, which we had reason to expect, we have another distich. With a personal object the *Hiph.* הֵבִישׁ means: to put to shame, confound, *i.e.* to bring it about that one must be ashamed of one's self (*e.g.* xliv. 8; cf. liii. 6, where the accusative of the person must be supplied in thought); when used absolutely it means: to act shamefully, as in the בֵּן מֵבִישׁ (a dissolute son) of the Proverbs; only here does it appear with a neuter accusative of the object, not in the signification "to defame, or slander" (Hitz.), a signification that it never has (not even in Prov. xiii. 5, where it is blended with הַבְאִישׁ, to make stinking, *i.e.* to give a bad reputation, Gen xxxiv. 30), but "to confound," *i.e.* "to frustrate" (Hupf.), which is, moreover, the most natural meaning here, seeing it is followed by עֲצַת. We must not, however, render it: ye put to shame, confound, because . . ., for what purpose would be served by this statement with such an inappropriate reason in support of it? The *impf.*, תָּבִישׁוּ, is used with the same shade of meaning as in Lev. xix. 17, and as the imperative elsewhere; and כִּי assigns the reason for the clause that is to be supplied in thought, or, if one line of the strophe is lost, that has dropped out (cf. Isa. viii. 9 *f.*): ye will effect nothing. עֵצָה is whatsoever the pious man, who as such is a sufferer, purposes to undertake for the glory of his God, or at least in accordance with the will of his God. All this the children of the world, who are in possession of worldly power, endeavour to frustrate; in the light, however, of the final decision, they do so in vain: Jahve is his refuge, or, literally, the place whither he betakes himself for safety, and where he finds hiding, concealment (צֵל,

טַל, סֵתֶר, מִסְתֶּר). In Baer's editions מַחְסֵהוּ has an orthophonic *dag.*, which makes the reading מַחְסֶהוּ unnecessary (cf. תַּעֲלִים, x. 1; טַעֲמוֹ, xxxiv. 1; לְאַפֵּר, cv. 22, and the like).

Ver. 7. This tristich sounds like a liturgical addition dating from the Exile, if one is not inclined, on account of it, to assign the whole Psalm to that period. For in a similar connection elsewhere (as *e.g.* in Ps. cxxvi.), שׁוּב שְׁבוּת means to turn the captivity or to bring back the captives; in such a connection, as *e.g.* in cxxvi. 4, Nah. ii. 3 (followed by אֶת; cf. Ezek. xlvii. 7), שׁוּב has a transitive signification, the *Kal* being preferred to the *Hiph.*, הֵשִׁיב (Jer. xxxii. 44, xxxiii. 11), in favour of the alliteration with שְׁבוּת (from שָׁבָה, to make a prisoner of war). And that the exiles also looked for redemption from no other quarter than from Zion, is plain, *e.g.*, from Isa. lxvi. 6. Not as if they were of opinion that Jahve still dwelt among the ruins of His habitation—it indeed had rather become a ruin in consequence of His having forsaken it (as we read in Ezekiel); but the moment when He returns to His people is also the moment when He begins to reoccupy His sanctuary; and this, reappropriated by Jahve even before it is externally restored, is the focus of the divine judgment on Israel's foes, as well as the luminous spot in the reverse side of this judgment, the final redemption; and, therefore, even during the Exile, Jerusalem is the place towards which their eyes are directed (the *Kibla*), when they engage in prayer (Dan. vi. 11). It would not, therefore, seem strange, if a psalmist belonging to the Exile should express his longing for redemption in the words: who gives, = oh that one would give, = oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion. Seeing, however, that שׁוּב שְׁבוּת also means metaphorically "to turn the misfortune" (as in Job xlii. 10, Ezek. xvi. 53, perhaps also in Ps. lxxxv. 2, cf. *v.* 5), שְׁבוּת having generalised its signification exactly in the same way as the German "*Elend*" (Old High German

elilenti, sojourn in a foreign land, banishment, homelessness), "exile," "misery," the לדוד of the title cannot be decisively set aside simply because of that expression occurring here. Even Hitzig translates: "would that Jahve would turn the affliction of His people," looking upon this Psalm as having been composed by Jeremiah during the time that the Scythians were in the land. If this translation is possible (which cannot be denied), we adhere to the לדוד of the title, and more especially as the supposed authorship of Jeremiah rests upon an ignoring of his reproductive character. The condition of the true people of God in the time of Absalom was really a שְׁבוּת in more than a figurative sense. We do not require, however, to seek for such a point of support in the history of these times; for in this concluding expression there is only formulated the view that prevails throughout the whole Psalm, the view viz. that, in the midst of the world, and even in the midst of the so-called Israel, the "righteous generation" finds itself in a condition of oppression, imprisonment and bondage. When God shall turn this condition of His people, of those viz. who are so in truth, then, Jacob shall exult, and Israel be glad. To rejoice then is the grateful duty of the redeemed. And how could they do otherwise!

PSALM XV.

THE CONDITIONS OF ACCESS TO GOD.

1 Jahve, who may sojourn in Thy tent,
Who may dwell upon Thy holy hill?

2 One that walketh blamelessly, and worketh righteousness,
And speaketh truth with his heart.

3 Who beareth not slander upon his tongue,
Nor doeth evil to his companion,
Nor bringeth reproach upon his neighbour.

4 Who is displeasing in his own eyes, worthy of contempt,
But those that fear Jahve doth he honour;
If he swear to his hurt—he changeth it not.

5 His money he giveth not for usury,
Nor taketh a bribe on account of the innocent—
He that doeth thus shall never be moved.

The previous Psalm distinguished from the mass of universal corruption a דור צדיק, and concluded with the expression of longing for the salvation out of Zion. Ps. xv. answers the question: who belongs to that דור צדיק, and for whom is the future salvation meant? Ps. xxiv., which was composed when the ark of the covenant was transferred to Zion, is similar to it. The sentiment that is expressed in our Psalm corresponds exactly to the unpretended piety and genuine humility, that manifested themselves in David in the fairest light on that occasion; cf. *v.* 4 *b* with 2 Sam. vi. 19, and *v.* 4 *a* with 2 Sam. vi. 21 *f.* The circumstance, however, that Zion (Moriah) is simply called הַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ in *v.* 1, is in favour rather of the time of the Absalomic exile, when David was cut off from the sanctuary of his God, whereas men, who were the very opposite of those characterized in the Psalm, were in possession of it (*vid.* iv. 6). It is natural to suppose that the characterization of the friend of God in the Psalm was occasioned by the moral corruption that prevailed in the time of the poet. Nothing, however, can be maintained with certainty, except that the Psalm presupposes that Zion had been raised to the dignity of being the holy hill, and that the ark of the covenant had been transferred to the אֹהֶל erected there (2 Sam. vi. 17). Isa. xxxiii. 13–16 is a splendid variation of this Psalm.

Vers. 1, 2. This distichic half of the Psalm already contains *in nuce* all that the tristichic half expands. The address to God is not merely a pleasing form (Hupf.), but the question is really put to God just as it runs. The

answer, however, is not, as in prophetical passages, to be taken as a direct answer given by God: the psalmist presents himself as a suppliant before God; he reads as it were what is passing in God's heart, and himself answers, in accordance with the mind of God, the question he has just put. גּוּר and שָׁכַן, which are usually distinguished from each other in the same way as παροικεῖν and κατοικεῖν in Hellenistic Greek, have here the same meaning; what is meant is not merely a passing, but an eternal גּוּר (lxi. 5); the difference between the two reciprocal terms is only this, that גּוּר, starting from the notion of a wandering life, denotes the finding of a permanent place of abode, while שָׁכַן, starting from the notion of settling down, denotes the dwelling of men together (cf. שָׁכֵן, neighbour) in a fixed spot.[1] The tent of Jahve and His holy hill are thought of here in their spiritual character as the places of the divine presence and of the community of God that has gathered round this; and, accordingly, the sojourning and dwelling there is not to be understood externally, but spiritually, with the setting aside and transcending of all limitations of space. This spiritual deepening of the Old Testament view, which was at first limited by notions of space, is found also in xxvii. 4, 5, lxi. 5; it is already implied where the notion of diligently visiting the sanctuary rises into that of permanently dwelling therein (lxv. 5, lxxxiv. 4, 5); whereas elsewhere, as *e.g.* in xxiv. 3, the external actuality of the Old Testament is not yet transcended. Thus we see the notion of the sanctuary now contracting itself within Old Testament limits, now expanding into the universality which is characteristic of the New; for, as regards the idea of the sanctuary as well as that of sacrifice, the spirit of the

[1] In Arabic جار الله is the client or vassal of God, the one who as it were dwells within the jurisdiction of God's castle, and جِيرَة is the right of asylum.

New Testament is already stirring, and powerfully working its way through its cosmical husk, without however the latter being as yet broken.

The answer to this question, which is meant in such a New Testament sense, is also no less like the declaration of the New Testament: not they that say Lord, Lord, but they that do God's will, have the right to enjoy His hospitality and to be inmates of His house; His will, however, concerns the essence of the Law: our duties to our fellow-men, and the inner attitude of the heart. In הוֹלֵךְ תְּמִים (here and in Prov. xxviii. 18), תְּמִים is either a more specific definition of the subject: one walking as an upright man, like הוֹלֵךְ רָכִיל, one going about as a slanderer (cf. הַיָּשָׁר הֹלֵךְ, Mic. ii. 7, "the upright as one walking"), or it is an accusative of the object, as in הֹלֵךְ צְדָקוֹת (Isa. xxxiii. 15): one who walks uprightness, *i.e.* one who makes it his way, his manner of acting, which is strongly commended by the הֹלְכִים בְּתֻמִּים of lxxxiv. 12 (those walking in uprightness). In the latter case תְּמִים means *integrum*, = *integritas;* it denotes the full, undivided, and unreserved surrender of one's self to God (Deut. xviii. 13) and the Good. Instead of עֹשֵׂה צְדָקָה it is said poetically פֹּעֵל צֶדֶק. The characterization of his manner of walking and acting is followed in *v.* 2 *b* by that of his speaking: speaking truth with his heart. If אָמַר had been used, ב would have been the ב of the place (Hitz.), as in xiv. 1; but along with דִּבֶּר (cf. xxxix. 4, cxix. 13) it is the ב of the instrument: he so speaks truth that his heart is in what he says. Three features of his character are indicated: his blameless walk, his acting in accordance with God's will, and his unfeigned truthfulness.

Vers. 3–5. The distich containing the question and that containing the general answer are now followed by three tristichs that answer the question in detail. Ewald counts 10 clauses, in which the whole life of the godly man is here

traced back to its ethical principles; but the scheme of 3 × 3, which we have adopted, was more certainly intended. The description proceeds in independent clauses, which, however, have the logical value of relative clauses; the *perff.* have the signification of abstract presents, for they are expressive of qualities that have proved themselves in practice, of a habitual way of acting, of that which he, who is here in question, never did, and which it is, therefore, not his nature to do. רָגַל means to go about, whether it be in order to spy out (the usual meaning) or to gossip and slander (here, and the *Piel* in 2 Sam. xix. 28; cf. רָכִיל, רָכַל). Instead of בִּלְשֹׁנוֹ it is said: עַל־לְשֹׁנוֹ (with orthophonic *dag.* in the second ל, in order that it may be read with emphasis and not be slurred over), because the word, before it is uttered, lies upon the tongue; the speaker brings it up from within, and puts it upon his tongue or lips (xvi. 4, l. 16, Ezek. xxxvi. 3). The assonance לְרֵעֵהוּ רָעָה is full of meaning: to do evil to him who is connected with us by the bond of blood and of familiar intercourse is a sin that is self-condemned. In Ex. xxxii. 27 also, קָרוֹב is a parallel word to רֵעַ; both are here meant to refer not merely to fellow-countrymen; for that which is sin in itself and under all circumstances, is sin also according to Old Testament morality in relation to every man. The combination of נָשָׂא with עַל and the usage elsewhere of the phrase נָשָׂא חרפה, "to bear reproach" (lxix. 8), forbid our taking נָשָׂא, when combined with חֶרְפָּה, in the signification: *efferre* = *effari* (Hupf. and others). Seeing that נָשָׂא is *tollere* as well as *ferre*, it means to bring or lay reproach upon any one; reproach is a burden, which may be more easily laid on than cast off; *audacter calumniare, semper aliquid hæret.*

In 4 *a* we must adhere to the interpretation, of which Hupfeld says contemptuously, that Hitzig has picked it up out of the dust: "small is he in his own eyes, despised." The Targ., Saad., Aben Ezra, Kimchi and Urbino (in his grammar, אהלְ מועד) also take נִבְזֶה בְּעֵינָיו together, although they interpret

it differently; and accordingly it is accented in Baer's edition: נִבְזֶה בְּעֵינָיו | נִמְאָס (*Mahpach, Asla Legarmeh, Rebia Magnum*).[1] God exalts him who is קָטֹן בְּעֵינָיו (1 Sam. xv. 17). David, when he brought in the ark of his God, could not satisfy himself with his self-depreciation (נָקַל), and appeared שָׁפָל בְּעֵינָיו (2 Sam. vi. 22). This humility, which David confesses also in Ps. cxxxi., is represented here and throughout the whole of the Old Testament (*e.g.* in Isa. lvii. 15) as a condition of being well pleasing to God; and it is in reality the chief of all the virtues. On the other hand, it is for the most part translated, either according to the common accentuation (with which the ב of בעיניו is dagheshed): the reprobate is despised in his eyes (Raschi, Hupf.), or in accordance with the above accentuation: despised in his eyes is the reprobate (Maurer, Hengst., Olsh., Luzzatto); but in neither of these translations have we any indication of the ethical ground of the נבזה or נמאס; and it is not good Hebrew to place together two participles without the article, and which, moreover, have the same meaning, in order that the one may be taken as subject, the other as predicate. Or may we perhaps explain it: such an one as slandereth, etc. is despicable in his eyes, worthy of being despised? But in that case the retrospective "such an one" must have been somehow or other expressed. On the other hand, if we translate it: "despicable is he in his own eyes, worthy of being despised" (Ges., § 134, 1), we can appeal to xiv. 1, where הִשְׁחִיתוּ is intensified by הִתְעִיבוּ in exactly the same way as נִבְזֶה here by נִמְאָס; cf. also Gen. xxx. 31, Job xxxi. 23, Isa. xliii. 4. In this way justice is also done to the antithesis of

[1] The common accentuation: בְּעֵינָיו נִמְאָס | נִבְזֶה tears בעיניו asunder from נבזה, to which, from its position, it belongs; while that of Heidenheim: נִבְזֶה בְּעֵינָיו נִמְאָס must be rejected for the accentualogical reason, that of two like disjunctives the second has always a less disjunctive value than the first. There remains, therefore, only the accentuation given above. The MSS. vary.

v. 4*b* to *v.* 4*a*: he appears to himself unworthy of all honour; to others, on the contrary, he continually renders honour; and the standard whereby he judges is the fear of God.

The self-denying and strict manner in which he fulfils his oaths shows how he himself fears Jahve. We ignore this sense of נִשְׁבַּע לְהָרַע, if we translate it: he swears to his neighbour (רֵעַ = רֵעֵהוּ), which must have been לְרֵעֵהוּ, or: he swears to the wicked (and keeps even to him what he has promised upon oath), which must have been לָרָע, for why should not the article have been elided, its non-elision being an exceedingly rare occurrence in the classical style (xxxvi. 6). The words refer to Lev. v. 4: if any one swears thoughtlessly לְהָרַע אוֹ לְהֵיטִיב, to do evil or to do good, etc. What is spoken of is the taking of oaths that one forgets, and the forgetting of which must be atoned for by a sin-offering, whether the purport of the oaths may have been something disagreeable and injurious, or agreeable and advantageous, to him that took them. The backward reference of the להרע to the subject (Targ., Jer.: *ut se affligat*) is self-evident; for to do injury to others is a sin, the vowing and performance of which, and not its omission, would require to be atoned for. On לְהָרַע = לְהָרֵעַ, *vid.* Ges., § 67, remark 6.

The hypothetical protasis (cf. *e.g.* 2 Kings v. 13) is followed by וְלֹא יָמֵר as apodosis. The verb הֵמִיר (syn. הֶחֱלִיף; *vid.* xlvi. 3) is native to the law of vows, which, if any one has vowed a sacrificial animal, forbids changing it into its money value (הֶחֱלִיף), as well as exchanging it for another, whether it be טוֹב בְּרָע אוֹ־רַע בְּטוֹב (Lev. xxvii. 10, 33). Naturally, the psalmist does not use these terms in the technical sense in which they were used in the Law: swearing also includes vowing, and לֹא יָמֵר denies not only any exchanging of that which was vowed, but also any altering of that which was sworn: in no wise does he misuse the name of God deceitfully.

In *v.* 5*a* also the psalmist, like the prophet Ezekiel (xviii. 8),

has a passage of the Thôra before his eyes, viz. Lev. xxv. 37; cf. Ex. xxii. 24, Deut. xxiii. 20. נָתַן בְּנֶשֶׁךְ means to give anything away, in order to take usurious interest (נֶשֶׁךְ from נָשַׁךְ, to bite, δάκνειν) for it. The person who takes or demands usury is מַשִּׁיךְ, the person who gives it is נֹשֶׁה, the usury itself is נֶשֶׁךְ. The trait of character in 5 *b* also recalls to our mind expressions that occur in the Mosaic law: שֹׁחַד לֹא לָקָח reminds us of the prohibition in Ex. xxiii. 8, Deut. xvi. 19, and עַל־נָקִי of the curse in Deut. xxvii. 25; on account of the innocent, *i.e.* against him, to condemn him. Whether it be by way of a loan or a present, he gives without claiming anything in return; and if he occupies the position of a judge, he is not accessible to bribery, more especially if the bribe be to secure the destruction of an innocent person. And now that his character is fully described, instead of concluding: such an one may sojourn, etc., the closing sentence is shaped otherwise, in conformity with the spiritual meaning of the psalmist's question: one that doeth thus shall never be moved (יִמּוֹט, *impf. Niph.*), he stands fast, being upheld by Jahve, hidden in His fellowship; nothing from without, no misfortune, can overthrow him.

PSALM XVI.

TAKING REFUGE IN GOD, THE HIGHEST GOOD, FROM STRAITS AND DEATH.

1 Preserve me, O God, for in Thee do I hide myself.
2 I say to Jahve: "Thou art the Lord,
Besides Thee there is for me no weal,"
3 And to the saints, that are on the earth:
"These are the excellent, in whom is all my delight."

4 Their anguish shall be multiplied who have taken an idol in exchange—
Their drink offerings of blood will I not pour out,
Nor take their names upon my lips.

5 Jahve is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup;
Thou makest my lot magnificent.

6 The measuring lines fell to me in pleasant places;
Yea, the inheritance seems beautiful to me.
7 I bless Jahve for giving me counsel;
Even in the night seasons my reins admonish me.
8 I set Jahve before me continually,
For He is at my right hand—therefore I am not moved.

9 Therefore my heart rejoices, and my glory exulteth,
My flesh also will dwell free from care.
10 For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades,
Nor give up Thy godly one to see the pit;
11 Thou wilt make me know the path of life—
Fulness of joy is in Thy presence,
Pleasures are in Thy right hand for evermore.

The preceding Psalm concluded with לְאֵיתָוֹט; this word of promise is repeated in xvi. 8 as a word of faith in the mouth of David. A pattern of the unchangeable believing confidence of the inmate of God's house is here presented to us; for the poet who composed Ps. xvi. is in danger of death, as we may infer from the petition in *v.* 1 and the expectation in *v.* 10; yet there is nothing in it of bitter complaint, of sullen opposition, or of hard struggle: the cry for help is immediately swallowed up by a preponderating consciousness of blessedness and by a bright hope; throughout the whole Psalm there reigns a settled calm, an inward joy and a joyous assurance, which is certain of this, that everything that it may desire for the present and for the future it possesses in its God.

The Psalm is entitled לְדָוִד, and "David" even Hitzig confesses "may be inferred from its language." Dr. Robertson Smith, on the other hand, begins his article on this Psalm in the *Expositor* (1876, No. 24) with the remark: "The words 'of David' are no sure guide." It is quite true, as he says in his twelve lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881), that "in assigning any individual Psalm to David we must be guided by other arguments than

those of the titles" (p. 202). But whatever can mark a Psalm as Davidic we actually find combined here: thoughts crowding together in compressed language, which in *v.* 4 becomes bold even to harshness, but then becomes clear and winged; an antique, unique, and highly poetical character (אֲדֹנָי as a predicate, מָנָת, נַחֲלָת, שָׁפַר, תָּמִיד) and a fine grouping of the strophes; there are, moreover, coincidences of many kinds with undoubtedly genuine Davidic Psalms (*e.g.* cf. *v.* 5 with xi. 6, *v.* 10 with iv. 4, *v.* 11 with xvii. 15) and with ancient portions of the Pentateuch (Ex. xxiii. 13, xix. 6, Gen. xlix. 6). Scarcely any other Psalm shows in so many ways what deep roots psalm-poetry has struck into the Thôra, both as regards its contents and its language. As to the situation, *vid.* on Ps. xxx.

Ps. xvi. has the title מִכְתָּם לְדָוִד in common with Pss. lvi.–lx. After the analogy of the other titles, it must have a technical meaning; and this is of itself an argument against the derivation from כתם, to conceal (Arab. كتم, Assyr. *katâmu*), whether it be taken in the sense of κειμήλιον (as if it were כֶּתֶם, literally, a jewel), or in the sense of ἀνέκδοτον, a hitherto unknown poem (Hitz.). The LXX. translates it: στηλογραφία (εἰς στηλογραφίαν), for which the Old Latin version has *tituli inscriptio* (Hesych. τίτλος· πτυχίον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον). That this translation is in conformity with tradition is shown by that of the Targum: גְּלִיפָא תְּרִיצָא, *sculptura recta* (not *erecta*, as Hupf. renders it). Both these translations presuppose that כָּתַם has the signification *incidere*, *insculpere*, in which signification, if we compare Jer. ii. 22 and Isa. xxxviii. 9, it appears to be cognate with כתב. When we examine the whole of the Michtam Psalms more minutely, we see that they have two prominent features in common: sometimes significant and memorable expressions are introduced by דִּבֶּר, וַיֹּאמֶר, אָמַרְתִּי (xvi. 2, lviii. 12, lx. 8; cf. Isa. xxxviii. 10, 11, part of the Psalm of Hezekiah, which is entitled מִכְתָּם = מִכְתָּב, as it ought perhaps to be read), sometimes

such expressions are repeated after the manner of a refrain, as *e.g.* in Ps. lvi.: *I am not afraid, what can men do unto me;* in Ps. lvii.: *Be Thou exalted, Elohim, above the heavens; let Thy glory be above the whole earth;* in Ps. lix.: *For Elohim is my high tower, the God of my mercy.* Hezekiah's Psalm has both these characteristics. Accordingly, מכתם, like *ἐπίγραμμα*,[1] seems to mean primarily an "inscription," and then to be equivalent to an "inscription poem" or "epigram," seeing that in the Psalms of this description a felicitous saying is made prominent, whether by being introduced in a special way or by being repeated as a refrain, after the manner of an epigraph or a memorial stone.

The strophe-scheme is 5, 5, 6, 7. The last strophe, which has expanded into seven lines, is an expression of joyous hopes in the immediate prospect of death—hopes that extend even into eternity.

Vers. 1–3. The Psalm begins with a petition that is grounded upon faith, and the special reference of which is plain from *v.* 10: may God preserve him (which as אֵל, the omnipotent One, He is able to do), who has no other asylum in which he has hidden and still hides himself save Him. This short introit is without any parallel clause, and is therefore monostichic,—a sigh that expresses everything in few words. With this is closely connected the emphatic pronunciation שָׁמְרֵנִי, *schām^{e}reni*; for so we must read it, just as we must read *schām^{e}rah* in lxxxvi. 2, cxix. 167 (cf. on עֲשָׂקָה, Isa. xxxviii. 14), according to the express testimony of the Masora.[2]

[1] In modern Jewish poetics מכתם is really the name for the epigram; Karaitic Hebrew uses כָּתָם and כְּתוּם in the signification, "sign, character" (Gottlober, *Sefer Bikkoreth*, p. 213).

[2] The Masora remarks: ב׳ גרשין בספרא, *i.e.* twice in the Psalter the *ŏ* in the imper. שְׁמֹרה is displaced by *Gaja* (*Metheg*) and raised into *ā* (Kimchi: לקמץ רחב; cf. *Michlol*, 38 *b*). *Vid.* Baer, *Thorath Emeth*, p. 22*f*. Notwithstanding this the grammarians are not agreed as to the pronunciation of the imperative and infinitive (cf. עָמְדָךְ, Obad. *v.* 11)

The text of the two following verses requires (so it seems) to be corrected in two respects. The Targum takes the reading אָמַרְתְּ as an address to the soul (cf. Lament. iii. 24*f.*); but the fact that the soul is not mentioned is an argument against this interpretation (just as also in 2 Sam. xiii. 39, וַתְּכַל דָּוִד, we may not assume an actual ellipsis of נֶפֶשׁ). This reading really rests upon a failure to recognize the defective writing, אָמַרְתָּ (Ges., § 44, remark 4). Hitzig and Ewald (§ 190 *d*) conjecture that in such cases an apocope after the analogy of Aramaic (אֲמַרְתְּ or אֲמַרְתָּ) lies at the root of the form (just as the *i* of the 2nd pers. fem., קָטַלְתִּי, which is retained in Arab. and Ethiopic, is rejected by Hebrew and Aramaic); and the frequent occurrence of this defective way of writing (ידעתי = ידעתי, cxl. 13, Job xlii. 2, בניתי = בנית, 1 Kings viii. 48, עשׂיתי = עשׂית, Ezek. xvi. 59; cf. 2 Kings xviii. 20, אמרת, now pointed אמרתָ, with Isa. xxxvi. 5) does really seem to have had at least its occasion in such a slurring over of the *i* as was peculiar to the spoken language; although אמרת, if David so wrote, was not intended to be read otherwise than in xxxi. 15, cxl. 7.

David first of all avows his allegiance to Jahve, to whom he unconditionally submits himself, and whom he sets over everything without exception. Seeing that the suffix of אֲדֹנָי (literally *domini mei* = *domine mi*, Gen. xviii. 3; cf. xix. 2), which has almost entirely lost its significance in the usage of the language, does here and there, particularly in xxxv. 23, assert its original meaning, we may perhaps interpret it here also, not: "the Lord art Thou," but "my Lord art Thou"; though the predicative function of אדני is not in favour of this interpretation here. "Thou art the Lord" is equivalent to "Thou art the Lord in an absolute and exclusive manner."

forms when so pointed. Lonzano, Luzzatto and others read *schŏmereni*; but *Kamez Chatuf* and *Metheg* mutually exclude one another. König (*Lehrgeb.*, p. 105 *ff.*) contends in vain against the undeniable fact that ָ is always the full vowel *ā*.

It is the unreserved and joyous (filial rather than servile) feeling of dependence, that is expressed in this first clause of his confession. For as the second clause says, Jahve, who is his Lord, is also his benefactor, yea even his highest good. The preposition עַל frequently introduces that which extends over something else (Gen. xlviii. 22; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 8, xcv. 3) and is added to it (Gen. xxxi. 50, xxxii. 12, Ex. xxxv. 22, Num. xxxi. 8, Deut. xix. 9, xxii. 6), being placed over or alongside of it. So here also: "my weal, *i.e.* whatever makes me truly happy, is not over Thee" *i.e.* "in addition to Thee, beside Thee," equivalent in meaning to "apart from Thee," or "without Thee" (as Targ., Symm., and Jer. render it), "Thou art it alone and without exception." Taking the עַל thus, there is no need for the conjecture that בַּל should be changed into כַּל, and that the poet wrote: כל־טובתי עליך; for this sense of עליך Riehm rightly refers to lxxiii. 25. The poetical בַּל, which is contracted from בְּלִי (not; literally: annihilation), and which was unknown to the literature previous to the time of David, presents no difficulty; as in Prov. xxiii. 7, it stands briefly for בַּל־תֶּהֱיֶה. "Just as *Thou art the Lord!*" Hengstenberg remarks, "is the response of the soul to the *I am the Lord thy God* of Ex. xx. 2, so *Thou alone art my salvation!* is the response to the *thou shalt have no other Gods beside Me* (עַל־פָּנָי)." The psalmist knows no fountain of true happiness save Jahve; in Him he has everything; his treasure is in heaven.

Such is his avowal of allegiance to Jahve. But he has also those upon earth, his fellowship with whom he now avows. Transposing the ו let us read:

וְלִקְדוֹשִׁים אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ
הֵמָּה אַדִּירֵי כָל־חֶפְצֵי־בָם׃

While Diestel's alteration: "in the saints, who are in his land, he glorifies himself, and all his delight is in them," estranges this verse from itself, the above transposition of the

ו to the beginning of the sentence[1] suffices to disencumber it of all its difficulties, and that too in a way that is quite in keeping with the context. Now it is clear that, as some have already conjectured, לקדושים is a dative governed by אָמַרְתִּי, the influence of which is still felt; it is clear what is meant by the clause אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ, which distinguishes the object of affection that may be found here below from that, incomparably the highest, which is to be found above; it is clear what is the antecedent to which הֵמָּה refers, whereas this purely descriptive relative clause, אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ הֵמָּה (which von Ortenberg transposes into אֲשֶׁר אֶרְצָה בָּהֵמָּה), usually appears useless, and surprises one both by its redundancy (since המה is superfluous; cf. *e.g.* 2 Sam. vii. 9, ii. 18) and by the collocation of its words (which is that which is usual in negative sentences, Gen. vii. 2, Deut. xx. 15, 20, 2 Chron. viii. 7; cf. on the other hand Gen. ix. 3, Num. ix. 13, xxxv. 31, Ruth iv. 15, Ezek. xii. 10, Hagg. i. 9); it is clear, in what sense אדירי alternates with קדושים, seeing it is not those whom the world accounts אדירים (cxxxvi. 18, 2 Chron. xxiii. 20) because of their external power and their external possessions, but the saints, the holy, that are prized by him as being also glorious, partakers of a higher glory and worthy of a higher honour; and, moreover, this re-adjustment of *v.* 3 is in keeping with the *Michtam* character of the Psalm.

The thought which we thus obtain is that which one would naturally expect (love to God and love to His saints), and which they had also to extract from the present text, either by translating with de Wette, Maurer, Dietrich and others: "the saints, who are in the land, these are the excellent, in whom I have all my delight"—a *Waw apodoseos* with which one could be satisfied only if it were וְהֵמָּה (cf. 2 Sam. xv. 34),

[1] Approved by Kamphausen and by the reviewer in the *Lit. Blatt* of the *Allgem. K. Z.* (1864, p. 107); cf. Riehm in Hupfeld, i. 413. Baethgen, on the other hand, in *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1880, p. 754*f.*, is of opinion that the text should be corrected after the LXX.

or even: "the saints who are in the land and the glorious —all my delight is in them." According to both these interpretations, לְ would be an exponent of the *nom. abs.*, which is usually placed at the beginning of the sentence, and this לְ of reference (Ew., § 310 *a*) is really common to every kind of style (Num. xviii. 8, Isa. xxxii. 1, Eccles. ix. 4), whereas, if it were understood of the fellowship in which he stands when thus avowing his allegiance to Jahve: attaching myself to the saints (Hengst.), associating myself with (von Lengerke), among the saints (Hupf., Thenius), לְ would be the most easily misunderstood of all prepositions and would make *v.* 3 a clumsy appendage to *v.* 2. If, however, we take לְ as the לְ of reference, the elliptical *constructivus* וְאַדִּירֵי, to which we should have to supply הָאָרֶץ, remains a stone of stumbling that cannot be set aside; for neither can such an isolation of the construct form from its genitive be shown to be syntactically possible in Hebrew (*vid.* Thenius and Keil on 2 Kings ix. 17), nor is it necessary to assume here what cannot be shown to exist elsewhere, seeing that there is no harshness in subordinating כל־חפצי־בם as a genitive to ואדירי (Ges., § 116, 3). And yet, if we retain the reading ואדירי, this way of taking the words ואדירי כל־חפצי־בם together is opposed both by the form of the sentence, which, beginning as it does with לְ, leads us to expect an apodosis, and by the relation of *v.* 3 to *v.* 2, according to which the salient point in the declaration must lie precisely in כל־חפצי־בם.

Thus, therefore, we come back to the above easy correction of the text. The קְדוֹשִׁים are those in whom the will of Jahve with regard to Israel, that it should be a holy people (Ex. xix. 6, Deut. vii. 6), has come to be fulfilled; they are the living members of the *ecclesia sanctorum* on this side the grave (for there is also such a Church in the other world, lxxxix. 6). Glory, δόξα, is the manifestation of holiness. It is destined by God (cf. Rom. viii. 30) for the saints, whose moral nobility is for the present still enveloped in the servile

form of the עָנִי; and in the eyes of David they possess it even now. His spiritual glance pierces through the servile form. His judgment is like the judgment of God, who is his All in All. The saints, and none but they, are also the illustrious in his estimation. His whole delight is in them; all his affection and esteem are bestowed upon them. The community of the saints is his *Chephzibāh* (Isa. lxii. 4; cf. 2 Kings xxi. 1).

Vers. 4, 5. As he loves the saints, so on the other hand he abhors the apostates and their idols. We must construe אַחֵר מָהֲרוּ as an appositional relative clause to the preceding one: *multi sunt cruciatus* (cf. xxxii. 10) *eorum, eorum scil. qui alium permutant.* The expression would be more flowing, if it were יִרְבּוּ: they multiply or aggravate their pains who, etc., so that אחר מהרו would be the subject (as *e.g.* in יְהֹוָה אֲהֵבוֹ, he whom Jahve loves, Isa. xlviii. 14). But all the ancient versions read the *Kal;* the construction follows the *schema* of the *syntaxis ornata* (Prov. xiii. 4, xiv. 13, Isa. xvii. 6; cf. on 2 Sam. xxii. 33, Ps. lxxi. 7). This *v.* 4 is the perfect antithesis of *v.* 3. In his eyes the saints are even now the glorious, those in whom he has all his delight; whereas, as he is well aware, a wretched future certainly awaits the idolatrous, and their worship, yea even their names are an abomination to him. The suffixes of נְסָכֵיהֶם and שְׂמוֹתָם may, after the analogy of Ex. xxiii. 13, Hos. ii. 19, be made to refer to the idols, if we take אַחֵר collectively as equivalent to אֲחֵרִים (as in Job viii. 19); but it is more natural to give them the same reference as עִצְּבוֹתָם. The latter does not mean "their idols" (for idols are עֲצַבִּים), but (from עַצָּבֶת, construct עִצְּבַת) their torments, pains (cxlvii. 3, Job ix. 28); the thought is the same as in 1 Tim. vi. 10: ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις ποικίλαις. אַחֵר is a general and most comprehensive designation of everything that is not God and which man, nevertheless, makes his idol beside God and in opposition to God (cf. Isa. xlii. 8, xlviii. 11). מָהֲרוּ cannot mean

festinant; for only מָהַר occurs in this sense; and even it occurs but once with a local, but not with a personal, accusative of the direction (Nah. ii. 6). We must, therefore, translate it (and the perfect also agrees better with this translation): they have taken in exchange that which is not God (מָהַר like הֵמִיר in cvi. 20, Jer. ii. 11, *ἀλλάσσειν*, Rom. i. 23, after which Baethgen and Grätz hold that הֵמִרוּ was the original form here), perhaps with the secondary meaning of wooing and courting (cf. the phrase זָנָה אַחֲרֵי), for מָהַר is the proper word for acquiring a wife by paying down the price asked by her father (Ex. xxii. 15). With such people, who may seem אַדִּירִים in the eyes of the world, but for whom there awaits a wretched future, David has nothing to do: he will not pour out such drink-offerings as they pour out. These libations are not said to be מִדָּם, as if they actually consisted of blood, viz. the blood of animals; for though מִדָּם certainly implies the reason why they were worthy of abhorrence (and, therefore, Smith thinks of the human sacrifices that were offered to Moloch and Chemosh), the expression offers no occasion for our taking it in that sense; they are said to consist as it were of blood, because they were offered with blood-stained hands and consciences laden with blood. The מִן is the מִן of origin, here (as in Amos iv. 5; cf. Hos. vi. 8) of the material; in other passages also it serves to introduce such virtually adjectival adjuncts (x. 18, xvii. 14, lxxx. 14). In *v.* 4 *c* the expression of abhorrence culminates: even their names, *i.e.* the names of the idols[1] that they cry out, he hesitates to take into his mouth, which the book of the covenant (Ex. xxiii. 13; cf. *Const. apost.* v. 10: *εἰδώλων μνημονεύειν ὀνόματα δαιμονικά*) actually forbids an Israelite to do (cf. the judicial taking away of the names of the false gods in Hos. ii. 19, Zeph. i. 4, Zech. xiii. 2).

[1] In the Mischnah and Talmud שֵׁמוֹת expressly means the divine names.

As for himself, he espouses the cause of Jahve. Whatever he may desire, he has it in Him; and whatever he has in Him is also secured to him permanently by Him. חֶלְקִי does not here mean "portion of food" (Böttch.); for in this sense חֵלֶק (Lev. vi. 10) and מָנָה (1 Sam. i. 4) are synonymous; and such parallel passages as cxlii. 6 show what חלקי means when said of Jahve. According to xi. 6, כוסי as well as חלקי is the genitive: מְנָת חֵלֶק is the share of landed property that is assigned to any one, מְנָת כּוֹס the share of the cup according to the proportion determined by the paterfamilias (as to the form מְנָת, *vid.* on xi. 6). When Canaan was divided the tribe of Levi received no landed property, from which they might have supported themselves; Jahve was to be their חֵלֶק (Num. xviii. 20, Deut. x. 19), the offerings consecrated to Jahve were to be their food (Deut. xviii. 1*f.*). It is none the less true, however, that the whole of Israel is a *βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα* (Ex. xix. 6), a fact to which קדושׁים and אדירים in *v.* 3 already pointed, so that the very thing which the tribe of Levi exhibits in a national and external manner is true in its whole spiritual depth of every believer: it is not the earthly, the visible, the created, the material that has been assigned him as his possession and enjoyment, but Jahve, He alone; in Him, however, also perfect satisfaction.

In *v.* 5 *b* it is most natural to take תּוֹמִיךְ, as it stands, to be the *Hiph.* of a verb יָמַךְ (וָמַךְ). Such a verb, however, does not occur elsewhere, and we must, therefore, first of all attempt to explain the word in some other way. The most obvious explanation would be to take it as a participle, = תּוֹמֵךְ (Jefeth: انت داعم), just as perhaps יוֹסִיף (Isa. xxix. 14, xxxviii. 5, Eccles. i. 18) = יֹסֵף, a comparison which Aben Ezra (*Sefath Jether*, No. 421) and Kimchi (*Michlol*, 11*a*) have already made. In all these three passages, however, this יוֹסִיף is 3rd *impf. Hiph.*; Hebrew, in which *Ḳâtil*, with unaccented *Kesr*, has become *Ḳôṭél*, with a tonelong *Zere*, does not know

of a participial form in *i*;[1] so that if it were a participle we should have to vocalize it תּוֹמִיךְ like סֹבִיב in 2 Kings viii. 21. No fault could be found with the meaning we should then obtain: Thou maintainest my lot, so that no one can deprive me of it (Riehm). But the twofold *plena scriptio* makes this interpretation very questionable. If the poet had intended the participle of תמך, we should have expected אתה תּוֹמְכִי גורלי, a reading which the LXX., taking the *Chirek compaginis* as a suffix, may have had before it: *σὺ εἶ ὁ ἀποκαθιστῶν τὴν κληρονομίαν μου ἐμοί* (Böttch.). The conjecture תּוֹסִיף (Olsh., Then.), in the sense: "Thou art continually my lot," halts both in thought and in expression. Hitzig's conjecture, תּוּמֶּיךָ: "Thou, Thy Thummim, art my lot," is more successful and more tempting; but there is this to be said against it, that the תּוּמִּים are never mentioned (not even in Deut. xxxiii. 8) without the אוּרִים. The word is the *Hiph.* of וָמַךְ (יָמַךְ). Schultens has already compared the Arab. *wamika*, to be broad, the *Hiphil* form of which (أَوْمَكَ, to make broad) Syro-Arabic still retains in the language of the common people.[2] And seeing that in any case we must submit to assume that there is something very peculiar about this תומיך, it is not too bold to regard it as a *ἅπαξ γεγραμμ.*: Thou makest broad my lot, *i.e.* Thou dost vouchsafe to me a spacious dwelling-place, as the possession that falleth to me (גּוֹרָל regarded as *κλῆρος*)—a thought which *v.* 6 develops still further.

[1] The *i* of אֹיְבֶיךָ (which occurs thrice), possibly also that of אֹסְפֶךָ in 2 Kings xxii. 20, is to be accounted for in the same way as the *i* in יִלְדָתִיךְ; *vid.* on ii. 7.

[2] The Arabic lexicographers know only a noun, *wamka*, breadth (*amplitudo*), not the verb; and even the former does not belong to the universal, classical language (the لُغَة). But even in the present day الوَمْك (pronounced *wumk*), breadth, and *wamik* are in common use in Damascus, and only the verb is avoided in the better conversational style (Wetzstein).

Vers. 6–8. The measuring lines, חֲבָלִים, are cast (Mic. ii. 5) and fall to any one where and so far as his possession is assigned to him, so that נָפַל חֶבֶל is said even of the allotting to any one of the portion of land that is measured out to him (Josh. xvii. 5). נְעִמִים (written defectively according to the Masora, as also נְעִמוֹת in *v.* 11) is a *pluralet.*, the plural that is used to designate a combination of uniform, inseparable states or qualities, and of homogeneous relations of time and space (Ges., § 108, 2 *a*); and it means both agreeable circumstances, pleasantness (Job xxxvi. 11), and, as here, a pleasant locality, Lat. *amœna* (to which the נְעִמוֹת of *v.* 11 corresponds still better). The measuring lines have fallen to him in a delightful district, viz. in the fellowship of God which is so rich in enjoyment; this most blessed domain of love has become his paradisaic possession. With אַף he rises from the fact to the full satisfaction that it affords him: such an inheritance even seems beautiful in his eyes; he has an intense delight therein. נַחֲלָת (like זִמְרָת, יִתְרָת in Jer. xlviii. 36 according to the reading of Kimchi and others, תְּהִלָּת *Kerî* in Jer. xlix. 25) is, according to Ewald (§ 173 *d*), lengthened from the copulative form נַחֲלַת (like נְגִינַת in lxi. 1), and, according to Hupfeld, formed from נַחֲלָתִי in the same way as זִמְרָת is formed in Ex. xv. 2 (viz. by means of the apocope that is universal in Syriac, just as אָמַרְתִּ in *v.* 1 is perhaps from אָמַרְתִּי). Seeing, however, that in the first of these two ways of taking it the change of vowel is irregular, and that the latter has against it such a use of the form as we find in lx. 13 (cviii. 13), it is rather to be regarded as a curtailed form of נַחֲלָתָה: the inheritance (= such an inheritance) pleases me, literally, it seems beautiful to me. The verb שָׁפַר (√ שׁף, שׂף, סף, whence שׂוּף, *terere*, שָׂפָה, lip, literally *margo*, etc.) means to shave, rub, stroke and thereby make smooth and shining (cf. בישׂ, נשׂר), *intr.* שָׁפַר, like טָהֵר, or even שָׂפַר, to be smooth, shining, beautiful; it is used with עָלַי, referring to the beauty that is known and

felt by him (cf. Esth. iii. 9 with Eccles. ii. 17; *vid.* also the later way of expressing it in Dan. iii. 32). Seeing, however, that the giver and the gift are one and the same, his joy in his inheritance becomes of itself a constant, thankful benediction of the giver, for His (אֲשֶׁר, *quippe qui*) having counselled him (lxxiii. 24) to choose the one thing needful, the best part; even by night his heart keeps awake, even then his reins, which are conceived of as the seat of the blessed feeling of the possession of Jahve (*vid. Psychol.*, p. 268), admonish him (יִסְּרוּנִי here: to incite, spur on, in an ethical sense, as in Isa. viii. 11: to warn); he feels impelled from within to offer heartfelt thanks to the living and faithful God. He has set Jahve always before him; Jahve is the object towards which he constantly looks with undiverted gaze; and it is easy for him to have Him thus ever present, for He is מִימִינִי (supply הוּא, as in xxii. 29, lv. 20, cxii. 4), at my right hand, *i.e.* where my right hand begins, close beside me (the same meaning as לִימִינִי, עַל־יְמִינִי, cx. 1, 5; cf. Zech. iv. 3), so that he does not need to strain his fancy. The natural consequence of this both in consciousness and in reality is expressed by בַּל־אֶמּוֹט (without a conjunction): he will not, he cannot be moved, he will not be worsted or succumb.

Vers. 9–11. Thus then, without having to fear death, he has the most blessed prospect, as this concluding strophe, which consists as it were of seven rays of light, asserts. Because Jahve is so near at hand to help him, his heart rejoices (יִשְׂמַח), and his glory, *i.e.* his soul (*vid.* on vii. 6) exults, his joy breaking out, as the *impf. consec.* declares, into exultation. No passage in the Bible bears such a close resemblance to this as 1 Thess. v. 23. לֵב is πνεῦμα (νοῦς), כָּבוֹד, ψυχή (*vid. Psychol.*, p. 98), בָּשָׂר (according to its primary meaning *attrectabile*, that which is tangible), σῶμα; the ἀμέμπτως τηρηθῆναι, which the Apostle there desires for his readers in respect of all the three constituent elements of

their being, David here expresses as an assured expectation; for אַף implies that he hopes even for his body what he hopes for the spiritual element of his nature that is concentrated in the heart, and for the psychical element that has been raised to dignity both by creation and by grace: assured of victory he triumphantly looks death in the face, even his flesh will dwell or lie confidently, viz. without being seized with shuddering at the impending corruption. David's hope rests upon the conclusion: it is impossible for the man, who, in appropriating faith and in living experience, calls God his God, to fall a prey to death; for *v.* 10 shows that in לָבֶטַח יִשְׁכֹּן, abiding unharmed under God's protection (Deut. xxxiii. 12, 28; cf. Prov. iii. 24), what is thought of is preservation from death. By the LXX. שַׁחַת is translated: *διαφθορά*, as if it came from שָׁחַת, *διαφθείρειν*, which is perhaps really the case in Job xvii. 14; only in vii. 16 does the LXX. render it by *βόθρος*, which is more correct. It means literally "depression," from שׁוּחַ, to sink, to be sunk, like נָחַת from נוּחַ, רָחַת from רוּחַ. "To give over" to the underworld (עָזַב, lit. to free, let go) is equivalent to "to abandon" to it, so that one becomes its prey. What is denied is not merely such an abandoning, that, if one once falls a prey to the grave, one comes forth from it no more (Böttch.); but, as *v.* 10 *b* shows, the idea of any abandonment to it whatever is absolutely rejected. In 10 *b* "to see the pit" (xlix. 10), equivalent to "to undergo the condition of the grave," *i.e.* to suffer death (lxxxix. 49, Luke ii. 26, John viii. 51), is the opposite of "to see life," *i.e.* to experience and enjoy it (Eccles. ix. 9, John iii. 36), the sense of sight, as being the noblest of all the senses, serving to denote the *sensus communis* (*i.e.* the common sense lying at the basis of all feeling and perception) and also, in a figurative manner, all active and passive experience (*Psychol.*, p. 234). It is therefore the hope of not dying, or even if dying still not really to die, that David expresses in *v.* 10. For by חָסִידְךָ David means

himself. According to Norzi the Spanish Codices have חֲסִידֶךָ with the Masoretic note יתיר יו״ד; and it is in accordance with this *Keri* that the LXX., Targum and Syriac translate, and the Talmud (*Erubin* 19 *a*, *Joma* 87 *a*) and the Midrasch interpret it. The reading חֲסִידֶיךָ does not really exist; and it has also against it the individual form of expression that is all around it.[1]

In *v.* 11 the positive expression of hope is placed side by side with the negative expression of it in *v.* 10: Thou wilt grant me to experience (הוֹדִיעַ, as usual, said of the presentation of such a knowledge as the whole man and not merely his understanding has an interest in) אֹרַח חַיִּים, the path of life, *i.e.* the path to life (cf. Prov. v. 6, ii. 19, with Prov. x. 17, Matt. vii. 14), not conceived of, however, merely as leading to life at the last, but as leading to it at each successive step; חַיִּים in the same comprehensive sense as *e.g.* in xxxvi. 10, Deut. xxx. 15: life from God, with God, in God the living One; the opposite of death regarded as a manifestation of God's wrath and as separation from Him. Not to fall a prey to Hades and corruption is only the external side of that which David hopes for himself; on its inward side it is a blessed and glorious life in the other world. The second half of *v.* 11 consists of two members, and depicts this life which he so confidently expects. According to the accentuation, which does not mark חַיִּים with *Rebia Magnum* or *Pazer*, but with *Olewejored*, שְׂבַע שְׂמָחוֹת is not a second object dependent on תּוֹדִיעֵנִי, but the subject of a noun clause: a satisfying fulness of joys is אֶת־פָּנֶיךָ, with or by Thy face, *i.e.* connected with and naturally involved in the beholding Thy face (אֵת,

[1] Codices of the first class read חֲסִידְךָ, without distinguishing between a *Keri* and a *Chethib*. So also Brescia 1494, the Spanish Polyglott and other early printed editions. Those Codices that offer חֲסִידֶיךָ (without a *Keri*) are hardly worth considering in opposition to those just mentioned; *vid.* my treatise: *Complutensische Varianten zum alttest. Texte* (1878), p. 27.

preposition of fellowship, as in xxi. 7, cxl. 14); for joy is light, and God's face or *doxa* is the light of lights, a thought that is hinted at in the Talmud by the reading שְׂבַע instead of שִׂבְעַ. And all manner of pleasures (נְעִמוֹת) He holds in His right hand, bestowing them upon His own—a bestowal that lasts נֶצַח, *i.e.* לָנֶצַח. נֶצַח, starting from the primary meaning of conspicuous brightness, is duration that outlasts everything else—an expression for לְעוֹלָם which David himself has perhaps coined, for it makes its appearance first of all in Davidic Psalms. Pleasures are continually in Thy right hand—God's right hand does not become empty, His fulness is inexhaustible.

The application which the Apostles make of this Psalm (Acts ii. 29–32; xiii. 35–37) is based upon the consideration, that David's hope not to fall a prey to death was not realized in him, as was quite clear, to the unlimited extent in which the Psalm sets it forth, but that it was fulfilled in Jesus, who was not abandoned to Hades, and whose flesh did not experience the corruption of the grave; and that consequently the words of the Psalm are a prophecy of David pointing to Jesus the Christ, who was promised to him as the heir of his throne, and whom, on the ground of this promise, he had before him in prophetic consciousness. When we look into the Psalm, we see that it is only upon the relation in which he stands to Jahve the everliving One that the singer expressly grounds that hope; in so far we agree with Prof. Robertson Smith, that "in a moment of highest elevation" he seems to himself, in virtue of his fellowship with God, to be raised above death and Hades, and inaccessible to these. The singer, however, is David, a view which Smith sets aside without any reason, putting in the place of David a poet who felt the miseries of the division of the kingdom. We see no reason for giving up the testimony of the title so lightly. That it was David to whom it was given to express the hope, that was based upon the mystical relation of the חסיד to

Jahve, in such exuberant language, which the issue of the life of Jesus has sealed by fulfilling it historically, is comprehensible from the relation in which, according to promise, David stood to his seed, the Christ and Holy One of God, who appeared in the person of Jesus. Looking upon himself in the light of the promise as the anointed and beloved of God,[1] David becomes the prophet of Christ; but he speaks of himself, and what he says has also found its fulfilment in himself. And that, too, not merely in the sense that he did not succumb to any mortal danger so long as the kingship would have perished with him, and that, when he did die, his kingship nevertheless continued (Hofm.); nor merely in the sense that he was secured against all danger of death, until he had performed his life's task, and had fulfilled the vocation assigned to him in connection with the history of redemption (Kurtz)—that which he hopes for himself personally has found a fulfilment, which transcends such a manner of fulfilling it. Now that his hope has found in Christ its full historical and redemptive realization, it becomes through Christ a personal reality also for himself. For although it is true, on the one hand, that what he says extends beyond himself, and for that very reason points prophetically to Christ: *in decachordo Psalterio*, as Jerome boldly expresses it, *ab inferis suscitat resurgentem;* yet on the other hand that which is predicted comes back upon himself, in order to raise him also forth from death and Hades to the intuition of God. For, as the Church sings:

Mors et vita conflixere,
Resurrexit Christus vere,
Et cum Christo surrexere
Multi testes gloriæ.

[1] Schegg in Reusch's *Literaturblatt* (1867, p. 834) calls such Psalms as xvi., xxii., lxix., subjectively Messianic, in contradistinction to the objectively Messianic Pss. ii., xlv., lxxii., cx.

PSALM XVII.

RECOURSE OF ONE WHO IS PERSECUTED THOUGH INNOCENT, TO THE LORD, WHO KNOWETH HIS OWN.

1 Hearken, Jahve, unto righteousness, attend unto my mournful cry,
Give ear unto my prayer with guileless lips!
2 From Thy presence let my right go forth;
Thine eyes behold rightly.

3 When Thou provest my heart, searchest it by night,
Assayest me—Thou findest nothing:
If I think evil, it doth not pass my mouth.
4 Notwithstanding the doings of men, by the word of Thy lips
I have guarded myself against the ways of the violent.
5 My steps held fast to Thy tracks,
My footsteps did not slip.

6 Being such an one, I call upon Thee, for Thou hearest me, O God!
Incline Thine ear unto me, hear my speech.
7 Show Thy marvellous loving-kindnesses, Thou Helper of those that seek refuge
From those that rise up against them at Thy right hand.

8 Keep me as the apple, the pupil, of the eye;
Hide me in the shadow of Thy wings
9 From the ungodly, who would destroy me,
My deadly enemies, who compass me about.

10 Their caul they shut up,
With their mouth they speak haughtily.
11 They have already surrounded me at every step,
Their purpose is to hurl to the ground.
12 He is like a lion that is eager to tear in pieces,
And like a young lion lurking in a place of concealment.

13 Arise up, Jahve, confront him, cast him down,
Deliver my soul from the godless by Thy sword,
14 From men, by Thy hand, Jahve—from men of this world,
Whose portion is in life, and whose belly Thou fillest with Thy treasure;
They have children in abundance and leave superabundance to their sons.
15 As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness,
I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thine image.

Ps. xvii. is placed immediately after Ps. xvi. because it likewise (cf. xi. 7) concludes with the hope of a blessed and soul-satisfying vision of God. In other respects also the two Psalms have much in common, as *e.g.* the petition שָׁמְרֵנִי (xvi. 1, xvii. 8), the retrospect of fellowship with God by night (xvi. 7, xvii. 3), the invocation of God as אֵל (xvi. 1, xvii. 6), and much else besides the תָּמִיד of xvi. 5 and xvii. 5 (*vid. Symbolæ*, p. 49), notwithstanding that the tone of the two is otherwise exceedingly different. For in the series of the Davidic Psalms Ps. xvii. is the first of those that we call Psalms in an indignant style. In these, when he is describing the dissolute behaviour of his foes and of godless men in general, the language of the Psalms of David, which is elsewhere so winged and luminous, becomes harsher and, in keeping with the subject and the mood, full as it were of unresolved dissonances (Ps. xvii., cxl., lviii., xxxvi., 2*f.*; cf. x. 2–11); it is rougher, less flexible and wanting in its usual clearness and transparency. Even the tone of the language becomes darker; it becomes as it were a dull murmur; heaping up the suffixes *mo*, *āmo*, *ēmo*, it rolls on like pealing thunder, as *e.g.* in xvii. 10, xxxv. 16, lxiv. 6, 9, where David, describing his foes, speaks of them with indignation, or in lix. 12–14, lvi. 8, xxi. 10–13, cxl. 10, lviii. 7, where he after the manner of a prophet announces to them the judgment of God. The more vehement and irregular movement of the language in these passages is the result of violent mental excitement.

This Psalm has so many points of resemblance, both as regards the thoughts and their expression, with Davidic Psalms (among those we have expounded especially in Pss. vii. and xi., also in iv. and x.), that even Hitzig admits the genuineness of the לְדָוִד of the title. The author is persecuted and others along with him; foes, among whom one, their leader, is specially prominent, are attempting his life, and, breathing forth slaughter, have surrounded him in a most

threatening manner. In every respect this fits in with the situation of David in the wilderness of Maon (some three and three-quarter hours S.S.E. of Hebron) as described in 1 Sam. xxiii. 25 *f.*, where Saul and his men were so close upon the heels of David and his companions, that it was only by a happy accident that he escaped being captured.

In the title this Psalm receives only the name תְּפִלָּה, the most comprehensive and earliest (lxxii. 20) name of the Psalms; for it is only when they are sung liturgically and accompanied with music that they become שִׁיר and מִזְמוֹר. As a Psalm-title this expression is found five times in the Psalter (xvii., lxxxvi., xc., cii., cxlii.) and once elsewhere in the Old Testament (Hab. iii.). The תפלה of Habakkuk is a hymn arranged for music. In the Psalter, however, none of these Psalms bears any trace of having been arranged for music. The scheme of the strophes is 4, 7; 4, 4, 6, 7.

Vers. 1, 2. צֶדֶק is an accusative of the object: the righteousness, which the suppliant means, is his own (*v.* 15 *a*). He knows himself to be righteous not only in his relation to men, but also in his relation to God. In all such assertions of the pious self-consciousness, what is meant is a righteousness of life that has its ground in a righteousness by faith. Hupfeld, it is true, maintains that the Old Testament knows neither of a righteousness by faith nor of an imputed righteousness. If this were true, Paul would be grossly mistaken and Christianity would be built upon sand. But that faith is the ultimate ground of righteousness is asserted in Gen. xv. 6 and at other crises in the history of redemption; and that the righteousness which avails before God is a gift of grace, is a thought clearly set forth *e.g.* in the יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ of Jeremiah. It is true, the Old Testament looks at this matter empirically rather than philosophically, more (so to speak) after the manner of James than after that of Paul; but even the Old Testament righteousness of life is rooted in the grace of God, the Redeemer, towards sinful man, who in himself is

devoid of righteousness before God (cxliii. 2). There is, therefore, no self-righteousness in David's praying that the righteousness, which in his person is persecuted and cries for help, may be heard; for, on the one hand, he knows that in his personal relation to Saul he is free from מִרְמָה, *i.e.* from a self-deluded and hypocritical frame of mind. The shrill cry for help, רִנָּה, which he raises, is a cry that may be heard, because it is not lips of deceit with which he prays. The true state of the case is manifest לִפְנֵי ה׳; therefore may his right, *i.e.* that which belongs to him and is appropriate to him, go forth מִלְּפָנָיו, viz. by its being made openly known and being openly maintained;—may it go forth from Him, for His eyes, the eyes of the searcher of hearts (xi. 4), behold מִישָׁרִים (as in lviii. 2, lxxv. 3 = בְּמִישֻׁרִים, ix. 9 and freq.), in equity or righteousness, *i.e.* in conformity with fact and without partiality. מישרים might also be an accusative of the object (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 17); but the usage of the language is strongly in favour of our taking it as an adverb, an interpretation which is also suggested by the confirmatory relation in which 2 *b* stands to 2 *a*.

Vers. 3–5. In support of his sincerity David appeals to the divine testing and examination of his inward parts which he has undergone. The preterites in *v.* 3 set forth the divine transactions that preceded the result, בָּלַ֫תְּמְצָא, the testing viz. that was instituted, and which is conceived of in צָרַפְתַּנִי and also in בָּחַנְתָּ as a trying of gold by fire, and in פָּקַד as an investigation (Job vii. 18). The syntactical relation of the several expressions is the same as in Job xxiii. 10. The result of the scrutiny to which God subjected him by night, when moreover the very depth of a man's heart is disclosed, whether it be in the thoughts of him who is awake or in the phantasies of the sleeper, was and is this, that He does not find, viz. anything at all blameworthy in him, anything to

separate like dross from the gold. To the New Testament consciousness with its deeper and, as it were, microscopically sharpened insight into the abyss of sin, such a confession regarding one's self would be more difficult than to that of the Old Testament; for by means of the saving deeds recorded in the New Testament and the salutary consequences that have resulted from them, there has been effected for the New Testament consciousness a divorce and disruption between the spirit and the flesh which was unknown to the Old Testament to the same extent, although in such confessions even the Old Testament consciousness does not assert its freedom from all sin, but only from conscious love of sin and from an egotism that is opposed to God.

With זְמוֹתִי David begins to tell us how Jahve, instead of finding anything blameworthy in him, really found him. זְמוֹתִי certainly comes from זָמַם, which means originally "to compress" (whence the Arab زِمَام, *compressorium* in a great variety of shades of meaning: a rope or cord used as a rein, a comprehensive list), and then "concentration of thought."[1] But what form is it? It is either an infinitive formed after the analogy of verbs ל״ה, like חַנּוֹת (lxxvii. 10), with the accent falling regularly upon the last syllable, according to which way of taking it Hitzig translates: my meditation passes not beyond my mouth, and Riehm, interpunctuating differently: Thou wilt not find wicked meditation in me; or it is even the 1st *pers. præt.*, which is properly *Milel*, but occurs also as *Milra* (*e.g.* in Deut. xxxii. 41, Isa. xliv. 16; *vid.* on Job xix. 17), according to which Böttcher translates: if I thought anything evil, it should not pass beyond my mouth, or (since זָמַם may denote the resolution that pre-

[1] ذَمّ, to blame, has the same primary signification, fault-finding being represented as a lessening by means of compression, just as on the other hand praise (مدح) is represented as an amplifying (*amplificare*) by means of spreading out.

cedes the action, *e.g.* Jer. iv. 28, Lam. ii. 17): I have resolved my mouth shall not transgress. This latter interpretation has this against it, that עָבַר by itself in the ethical sense "to transgress" (cf. the עֲבֵרָה, *παράβασις*, of the Mischna) does not occur in the Bible, and that, when יַעֲבָר־פִּי stand thus together, the natural presumption is that פִּי is the object. We, therefore, prefer the interpretation of Böttcher, which takes זמותי as a hypothetical perfect, and which, as regards the syntax, has Prov. xxx. 32 in its favour. בל יעבר־פי is the expression of a purpose that is continually becoming a fact. The poet can bear this testimony to himself, that, even if evil thoughts do arise in his mind, he so represses them within, that they do not pass beyond his mouth, much less does he carry them into effect. Perhaps, however, the poet originally wrote פִּיךָ: "my meditation (my train of thoughts), it does not go beyond Thy commandment" (after Num. xxii. 18; 1 Sam. xv. 24; Prov. viii. 29), which, as being a statement of the result, fits in better with the scrutiny by night. The ל of לְפָעֲלוֹת need not be the ל of reference ("as to"); as in xxxii. 6 it is that of the state or condition; and, as is possibly the case also in Job xxxi. 33, Hos. vi. 7 (if אָדָם is not there the name of the first man), אָדָם is men as they are by nature and practice. בִּדְבַר שְׂפָתֶיךָ must not be connected with לְפָעֲלוֹת: notwithstanding that the world acts contrary to Thy revealed will (Hofm. and others), for פָּעַל בְּ cannot mean: to act contrary to one, but only: to influence one (Job xxxv. 6). These words must, therefore, be regarded as a more specific determination of the following שָׁמַרְתִּי: notwithstanding the doings and actings of men, he has, by virtue of the divine commandment, taken heed of the paths of the violent, viz. not to follow them. An example of this meaning of שָׁמַרְתִּי is found in 1 Sam. xxv. 21, where, as in Job. ii. 6, it means: I have kept (Nabal's property), so as not to lay hold of it. Jerome correctly translates *vias latronis*, for פָּרִיץ means one who breaks in, *i.e.* one who does damage in-

tentionally and in a violent manner. The confession regarding himself is still continued in *v.* 5; for if the *infin. absol.*, תָּכֹךְ, were taken as an imperative, we should have a prayer for constancy, which is foreign to this context. The perfect after בַּל is also opposed to our so taking it. We must, therefore, regard it as an *infin. historicus*, and interpret it after the analogy of Job xxiii. 11; cf. Ps. xli. 13 (corresponding with the Assyr. *tamâḥu*). The noun following the *infin. absol.*, which is usually the object, is here the subject, as *e.g.* in Job xl. 2, Prov. xvii. 12, Eccles. iv. 2 and freq. It is אֲשֻׁרַי, not אַשֻּׁרַי, for except in *v.* 11 and Job xxxi. 7 the שׁ of אֹשֶׁר (a step) is always without the *daghesh*.

Vers. 6, 7. It is only now, when he has laid bare his very heart and his walk before Jahve, that he resumes the petition which he has thus justified and grounded, and unfolds it in detail. The אני[1] standing beside קְרָאתִיךָ (the perfect, of that which has just now been put into execution) has some such meaning as this: being such an one as he has described himself to be according to the testimony of his conscience, he may call upon God, for God hears such and will therefore also hear him. הַט אָזְנְךָ corresponds exactly to the Latin *audi* (*aus-cul-ta*). The *Hiph.* הִפְלָה (הִפְלִיא, xxxi. 22; cf. iv. 4) means here to show by acting in an extraordinary and marvellous manner. As to this verb פָּלָה (פָּלָא), which, as is plain from פֶּלֶא,[2] פלא, فلى, means originally to search out, *exquirere*, and then to separate (√פל, cog. בַּר to split), *vid.* above on iv. 4. The danger of him who thus prays is great, but the kindnesses of God, who is able and ready to save, are

[1] In correct texts the word is pointed אֲנִי, as is always the case with אני when it has *Munach* and *Dechî* follows; *e.g.* also in cxvi. 16. This *Gaja* demands an emphatic intonation of the secondary word in relation to the principal word (here קראתיך).

[2] *Vid.* Bernstein's Lexicon to Kirsch's *Chrestomathie* sub. voc. פֶּלֶא, and Wetzstein in *D. M. Z.*, xxii. 160.

still greater. May He then disclose them in all their fulness in his behalf. The address to God is expressed after the manner of the Greek, which is fond of participles. If we translate it with Luther: "show Thy marvellous lovingkindness, Thou Saviour of those that trust in Thee, against those who thus set themselves against Thy right hand," חוֹסִים is used as absolutely as in Prov. xiv. 32, and the right hand of God is conceived of as ordaining and establishing. But "to rebel against God's right (not *statuta* but *dexteram*)" is a strange expression. There are still two other ways of connecting the words from which to make our choice: "Thou Deliverer of those who seek protection against adversaries with Thy right hand" (Hitz.), or "Thou Helper of those who seek protection against adversaries at Thy right hand" (Aben-Ezra, Tremell.). This last construction is to be preferred to the other two. For seeing that we say, on the one hand, מחסה מן, refuge from . . ., and on the other, חָסָה בְּ, to hide one's self in any one, or somewhere, this prepositional determination of the verbal notion (on which see above on ii. 12) must also be possible in both ways. מִמְּתַקוֹמְמֵיהֶם is equivalent to ממתקוממיהם in Job xxvii. 7, and חוסים בימינך are those seeking protection at Jahve's strong hand. The ב is meant in exactly the same sense as in connection with הִסְתַּתֵּר in 1 Sam. xxiii. 19 (Arab. استتر ب). In Damascus and throughout the whole of Syria—Wetzstein remarks on this passage—the weak surrenders himself to the strong with the words: انا بقبضة يدك, "I am in the grasp of thy hand (in thy closed hand), *i.e.* I yield myself entirely to thee."

Vers. 8, 9. The relationship in which Jahve has set David with Himself by assigning him his special vocation in life, and the relationship of love in which the latter stands to Jahve justify the oppressed one in making the largest requests. The apple of the eye (more exactly: the pupil of

the eye) is called אִישׁוֹן, the man (Arab. *insân el-'ain*), or, taking the termination *on* in a diminutive and endearing sense (like the Syriac *b'rânâ*, little son, *achûnâ*, little brother, and the like), the manikin of the eye, because the miniature of the person who looks into another's eye is reflected in it; it is also called בַּת־עַיִן, either because it seems to be born of the eye, and the latter has, as it were, concentrated itself in it; or rather, because the little image that is reflected in it is, as it were, the little daughter of the eye (here and Lam. ii. 18). The expression בָּבַת־עַיִן, which occurs in Zech. ii. 12, and which does not mean the gate, the opening, the sight, but as בַּת shows, the little boy, baby, or more exactly, the little girl of the eye, corresponds best of all to the Latin *pupilla* (*pupula*), Greek *κόρη*; cf. the Spanish *niña* (modern Arabic نبنى) *del ojo*.[1] It is surprising that in the passage before us אִישׁוֹן has the fem. בַּת־עַיִן in apposition to it. The construction might be genitival: "as the manikin of the apple of the eye," inasmuch as the godly man knows himself to be so near to God that his miniature is as it were reflected in the great eye of God. But (1) it is not בַּת־עַיִן but אִישׁוֹן that is the more common designation of the apple of the eye; and (2), if we adopt this construction, we miss the real point of the comparison, that the apple of the eye is an object of the most careful self-preservation. Jefeth translates it: "as the black of the apple of the eye;" but

[1] The interpretation of Zech. ii. 12 which is preferred by Pressel: the gate of the eye, is really admissible; for the pupil of the eye, the dark of the eye, may be represented as its בָּב (باب), its opening; but the Syriac *bâbthâ*, *bâbunâ* confirms the meaning we have given to the word in the text, and the *masc. bâb*, boy, as well as *bâb*, gate, is now also attested by means of Assyrian. On these names for the apple of the eye, among which בָּבְיתָא, בָּבְיתָא and the like are natural terms of endearment, *vid.* Fleischer in Levy's *Chald. Wörterbuch*, i. 149. The Indian Uphanischads teach: "the person that is beheld in the eye is the real self," viz. the immaterial as distinguished from the material and transitory.

בת־עין, the pupil, is itself this black of the eye. We have here, therefore, two designations of the apple, or more strictly, the pupil, of the eye, the one the more common and the other the more select; and these are combined, without any attention being paid to the gender of the former, in order to express the figure in as definite and emphatic a manner as possible. The primary passage for this bold petition which is presented by love is Deut. xxxii. 10, where the glaring anthropomorphism is obliterated by the LXX. and other ancient versions;[1] cf. also Sir. xvii. 22. There follows another figure, taken from the eagle hiding its young under its wings, which is likewise derived from Deut. xxxii., viz. from xxxii. 11, for the figure of the hen (Matt. xxiii. 37) is foreign to the Old Testament. There in his great hymn Moses already speaks of God's wings; but the double figure of the shadow of God's wings (here and xxxvi. 8, lvii. 2, lxiii. 8) was coined by David. "God's wings" are the spreadings out, *i.e.* the manifestations, of His love, which takes the creature under the protection of its intimate fellowship, and the "shadow" of these wings is the refreshing rest and security which the fellowship of this love affords to those who hide themselves in it from the heat of outward and inward conflict. Wings (جُنَح) and protection, refuge, help, are also correlative terms in Arabic. *V.* 9 informs us more particularly as to the position in which the poet finds himself. שָׁדַד means to force, to use violence, to destroy the life, stability, or possession of any one (Assyr. *šadâdu*, said of razing cities to the ground). According to the accents בְּנֶפֶשׁ is to be connected, not with יַקִּיפוּ, but with אֹיְבַי, and to be understood after the analogy of Ezek. xxv. 6: "enemies with the soul." These are enemies whose hostility is not merely superficial but deep-rooted (cf. ἐκ ψυχῆς, Eph. vi. 6, Col. iii. 23); the soul (viz. the hating and greedy soul, xxvii. 12, xli. 3) being that

[1] *Vid.* Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 324.

of the enemies, in exactly the same way as it would have been had we connected בְּנַפְשׁ with the verb; and, therefore, איבי נפשי would not only not have been more correct than איבי בנפש (as Hitzig thinks), but it would have been something totally different. They are purposing to destroy him (*perf. conatus*), and as if they were ravenous with hunger form a circle round about him, in order to swallow him up.

Vers. 10–12 declare what kind of people these persecutors are. Their heart is called fat, *adeps*, not as if חֵלֶב by itself could be equivalent to לֵב, more especially as the two words are from totally different roots (חֵלֶב from the root לב, λιπ, לֵב from the root לב, לף, to envelope: that which is enveloped, the kernel, the inside), but (without there being any need of the conjecture of Von Ortenberg: חֵלֶב לִבָּמוֹ סָגָרוּ, "they close their heart with fat") because it is, as it were, entirely grease (cxix. 70; cf. lxxiii. 7), and is, therefore, inaccessible to compassion, and altogether incapable of nobler emotions. To close the caul = the heart (cf. κλείειν τὰ σπλάγχνα, 1 John iii. 17) is equivalent to: to studiously confirm one's self in one's deficiency in respect of sympathy, tenderness, and generosity (cf. הִשְׁמִין לֵב = to harden, Isa. vi. 10). What was said of קוֹלִי in iii. 5 applies also to פִּימוֹ (which accords in sound with פִּימָה, Job xv. 27). On the other hand, אֲשׁוּרֵנוּ (after the form עַמּוּד) does not admit of being taken either as an accusative of the means and the instrument, or as the second accusative that is common enough in addition to the accusative of the object with verbs of surrounding (*e.g.* v. 13, xxxii. 7). But neither is there any need of the reading אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ, "I behold him"! (Hitz., Kamph.)—it being impossible to adduce another example in Psalm-poetry of such prominence being given to the subjectivity of the poet; for אֲשׁוּרֵנוּ may be an accusative of the member, like לחי in iii. 8 (cf. xxii. 17; Gen. iii. 15). It is true the step "is not a member" (Hitz.); but seeing that "step" and "foot" are correlative terms (cf. lxxiii. 2), the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος

is applicable also to the former; and just as Homer, *e.g.* says (Iliad vi. 355): σὲ μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν, so the Hebrew poet can also say: they have compassed us (and indeed) our step, each of our steps (so that we can neither go forwards nor backwards with our feet). עַתָּה states how far they have already proceeded in such violence. The *Kerî*, סְבָבוּנִי, gets rid of the change in the number of the *Chethîb*, סבבוני; seeing, however, that there are such parallels as lxii. 5, the latter is admissible; it also corresponds to the situation of David, who, pursued by Saul and at present reduced to straits, was at the head of a company of faithful followers. They set their eyes—so he proceeds in 11 *b*—upon casting down, viz. us who are surrounded, to the ground, *i.e.* so that we come to lie upon the ground. As in xviii. 10 and lxii. 4, נָטָה is transitive, the sense in which it occurs in lxxiii. 2 (cf. xxxvii. 31): to incline to fall (whereas in xliv. 19, Job xxxi. 7, it means to turn away from), receiving a transitive turn here, and בָּאָרֶץ (without there being any need of the conjecture בָּאֹרַח) is used instead of לָאָרֶץ (vii. 6) as expressing their ultimate design. With דְּמוּתוֹ one is singled out from the host of the enemy, viz. their chief; instead of saying דָּמָה כְּאַרְיֵה, the poet follows a peculiarity of the poetical style, in which verbal clauses are frequently changed into noun clauses, and says: his likeness is as a lion. Seeing that in Biblical Hebrew, as well as in Syriac and Arabic, כְּ is only a preposition and not a copulative conjunction (*vid.* on xxxviii. 14), we must not render the expression: as a lion longs to fall upon his prey; but: like a lion which longs, *i.e.* is eager to tear in pieces. In the parallel member of the sentence the participle is used instead of the attributive clause. כְּפִיר is the young lion, full grown, however, and with a full mane.

Vers. 13–15. The phrase קִדַּם פָּנָיו, *antevertere faciem alicujus*, means both to appear before any one with reverence (xcv. 2), and to confront any one in a hostile manner, to throw

one's self upon him (from קדם, قدم, √קד, to cut, the primary notion being that of the face or front, considered as something that is angular, keen-edged, standing out sharply). The foe springs upon David like a lion; may Jahve—so he implores—in his defence stand in the way of this lion and cast him down, so that, rendered harmless, he may lie there with bowed knees (כָּרַע, said of the lion in Gen. xlix. 9; Num. xxiv. 9). May He deliver his soul from the godless man חַרְבֶּךָ. We may look upon this חרבך as well as the following יָדֶךָ as a permutative of the subject (Böttcher, Hupf., Hitz.), a construction which is recommended by xliv. 3 and other passages; it is more probable, however, that such closer definitions are conceived of as accusatives; *vid.* on iii. 5. At any rate "sword" and "hand" are meant as instruments whereby the פַּלְטֵ (from the root פל, to split; cf. فرّ, فلّ, to escape, to flee), the rescuing, is to be effected. In *v.* 14 פַּלְטָה is still resounding, and just as מְמֵתִים (with a *Chatef* under the letter that is relieved of the reduplication, like מְמֵכוֹן in xxxiii. 14) corresponds to מֵרָשָׁע, so יָדֶךָ to חַרְבֶּךָ. ממתים (*plur.* of מת, men, Deut. ii. 34, whence מְתֹם, individually and collectively, each and every one), which taken by itself yields no sense, is repeated and made complete after the interruption caused by יָדְךָ ה׳, an extraordinary manner of breaking off and resuming the thought, which Hofmann (*Schriftb.*, ii. 2, 495) endeavours to remedy by altering the interpunction and the division of the verse. חֶלְדָּ[1] signifies duration (from חָלַד, خلد, to intrench one's self, and so to settle, effect a lodgment and abide), which may either mean permanence as contrasted with transitoriness (cf. خلود, eternity),[2]

[1] Also a Phœnician word: the Phœnician Ζεὺς Ἀλδήμιος, בעל חלדים (*vid.* Weber, *Indische Studien*, i. 378), corresponds to the Babylonian בעל איתן.

[2] In the Koran خلد is the word commonly used for remaining for ever in the state of punishment or reward.

the emphasis being laid upon the notion of enduring, or, if the idea of the temporary and, indeed, of reaction against the fact that one is fading away is prominent, it may mean temporal life in its transitoriness, for which reason חֶדֶל, finiteness, the finite world (from חָדַל, to have an end) is sometimes wittily used instead of חֶלֶד (cf. xlix. 2 with Isa. xxxviii. 11). The combination מתים מחלד is rejected by Riehm, who, contrary to the accentuation, takes חלד חלקם בחיים together (whose portion in life is of the world); but the construction is similar to that in x. 18, xvi. 4. The people meant are those who have no other home than the world, which passeth away with its lust, people ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου or υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. The meaning of the further description, חֶלְקָם בַּחַיִּים (cf. Eccles. ix. 9), is plain from the contrast in xvi. 5. The *Zinnor* of בחיים has comparatively more disjunctive force than that of וצפונך, as is always the case when two similar disjunctives come together. The חֵלֶק of the godly man is Jahve, and the sphere, within which the worldling claims his חלק, is הַחַיִּים, temporal, visible, material life; to his mind this surpasses everything else, whereas the former says: טוֹב חַסְדְּךָ מִחַיִּים (lxiii. 4). The contrast is not so much between this life and the life to come, as between the world (life) and God. Here we see right into the very heart of Old Testament faith. For Old Testament faith all the blessedness and glory of the future life, which the New Testament discloses, is bound up in Jahve. Jahve is its highest good, in the possession of whom it is raised above heaven and earth, life and death; to yield itself to Him blindly, without any explicit knowledge of a future blessed life, to find its satisfaction in Him, to rest in Him, to hide itself in Him when face to face with death, is the characteristic feature of Old Testament faith. חלקם בחיים expresses the mind as well as the lot of the men of the world. Material prosperity, which is their highest good, is also richly bestowed upon them. The words: "whose belly Thou fillest

with Thy treasures" (*Chethîb*: וְצָפִינְךָ, the usual participial form; as a participle, however, it is an Aramaising form), are not intended by the poet to indicate that God leads them to repentance by the riches of His goodness; what they mean is rather this, that by satisfying their longing, which is simply after what is sensuous, He deprives them altogether of any claim to higher possessions that reach beyond the world and temporal life. Accordingly צָפוּן is used here in exactly the same sense as צְפוּנִים (from צָפַן, to draw anything close to one's self, to reserve, to keep by one) in Job xx. 26. בֶּטֶן is the belly, not, however, as curving outwardly, but the abdominal cavity, and, in general, the interior of the body.[1] There is no tincture of murmuring or envying in the words; the godly man, who lacks these good things out of God's treasury, has higher pleasures; he can exclaim: "how great is Thy goodness, which Thou hast laid up (צָפַנְתָּ) for them that fear Thee" (xxxi. 20). Children in abundance also belong to the good things, with which God fills the belly and the house of the godless (Job xxii. 17*f.*); these are usually represented as a blessing bestowed upon piety (cxxvii. 3; cxxviii. 3*f.*); for those, however, who do not recognize the giver, they are a snare, a temptation to indulge in self-glorying (Job xxi. 11.; cf. Wisdom iv. 1). בָּנִים is not the subject, but, as all the old translators from the original recognize, an accusative, like יָמִים in the expression שְׂבַע יָמִים, to be sated with life.[2] As to עוֹלְלִים *vid.* on viii. 3. יֶתֶר (from יָתַר, to be stretched out lengthwise, then to be overhanging, overtopping, projecting, superfluous, over) means here, as in

[1] As to the primary meaning of the word, *vid.* Fleischer in Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, ii. 578 *b*, where the cognate Chald. and Arab. expressions are also referred to. In Arab. the back is called *ẓahr*, as being a part of the body which is prominent outwardly; but *baṭn* is the abdomen, so named from its concavity; cf. גּוּף, *ǵauf*, a term designating the body as to its inner cavity.

[2] The *text rec.* of the LXX. did not have *υἱῶν* (Jer.: *filiis*), but *υἱέων* (Itala: *porcina* or *suilla*); *vid.* Rönsch, *Itala* (1869), p. 47.

Job xxii. 20, superabundance of possessions (*vid.* Fleischer on Job xxx. 11).

With אֲנִי he sets his incomparably greater happiness over against that of his foes. He, the misjudged and persecuted of men, will behold God's face, בְּצֶדֶק, in righteousness, which will then find its gratuitous reward (Matt. v. 8, Heb. xii. 14), and when this hope of his is fulfilled, he will thoroughly refresh himself with God's form, תְּמוּנָה (from מוּן, ماثَ, *fut. i*, to form = to feign, just as خلق, viii. to cultivate one's mind = to devise, invent, whence also מִין, image, *species*). To take the seeing of the divine countenance here in the sense of experiencing the gracious effects which proceed from the face of God being once more turned towards him and unveiled is not sufficient; the parallel member of the verse demands an actual vision,—such a vision, *e.g.*, as that described in Num. xii. 8, according to which Jahve stood over against Moses in the very form of His substance and without the mediation of any accommodative visionary symbolical representation of Himself; although at the same time we learn from Ex. xxxiii. 20, where the vision of the divine countenance is denied to Moses, that the self-manifestation of Jahve in His intercourse with Moses is not to be thought of as taking place without a veiling of Himself that would make him able to endure the vision. Here, however, where David expresses a hope, which is the final goal, the very climax of all his hoping, we have no right to limit in any way either the vision of God, who in love allows him to behold Him (*vid.* on xi. 7), or his satisfaction with the glorious manifestation of His holy being (LXX. τὴν δόξαν σου; *vid. Psychol.*, p. 49). If this is right, בְּהָקִיץ cannot mean: when I awake out of this night's sleep (Ew., Hupf., and others); for even allowing that the Psalm was composed just before the poet fell asleep, what meaning would there have been in his adjourning the realisation of so transcendent a hope to the time when he had awoke out of his natural

sleep? But neither can the meaning be "to awaken to a new life of blessedness and satisfaction through the sunlight of the divine favour again rising upon him after the night and the darkness of the misery, in which the poet at present still finds himself" (Kurtz); for awakening out of a night of sorrow is an idea that is unsuitable, and which for that very reason cannot be supported by any other passages. There remains, therefore, only (cf. Böttcher, *De Inferis*, § 365–367) the awakening out of the sleep of death. That all those who are lying in their graves shall one day hear the voice of Him that awakes the dead, as is taught in the post-exilic period (Dan. xii. 2), was a doctrine that David indeed did not yet know. But why should not this truth of revelation, towards which prophecy advances with giant strides (Isa. xxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14), be already audible even in the Psalms of David, just as it was later in the Book of Job, as a bold postulate of faith, as a hope that has been rescued from the cheerless conception of Sheol? Nor is the morning in xlix. 15 some morning or other that will very soon follow upon the night, but the final morning, which brings deliverance to the upright and enables them to obtain dominion. Such a certain knowledge of the fact of the resurrection as, according to Hofmann (*Schriftb.*, ii. 2, 490), has existed in the Old Testament from the very first, is not expressed in such passages. For lamentations like those in vi. 6, xxx. 10, lxxxviii. 11–13 show that such a certain knowledge did not exist; and if the Old Testament literature which we now possess allows us any insight into the history of the various stages through which the intellectual apprehension of the facts of redemption has passed, it was not till about the time of the Exile that the knowledge of the future resurrection of the dead passed over from the prophetic word into the believing consciousness of Israel; up to that time faith no doubt did venture to hope for a deliverance from the state of death, but, without having any express word of

promise to which it could appeal, it did so only by means of an inference from the word that was already extant and which it apprehended in all the depth of its meaning. So it is here also. David certainly expresses the hope of a blessed vision of God, which will be vouchsafed to him as being righteous in God's sight; he hopes that, even if he should succumb to the present danger and sleep the sleep of death (xiii. 4), it will be vouchsafed to him as one reawakened from that sleep (Isa. xxvi. 19), and, therefore (although this idea does not directly coincide with the former), as one raised from the dead. But this hope is not a believing appropriation of a "certain knowledge"; it is an anticipation which, basing itself upon the revelation of God which is already extant, flashes up from his consciousness of fellowship with Him.

PSALM XVIII.

DAVID'S HYMNIC RETROSPECT OF HIS LIFE, WHICH WAS SO RICH IN MERCIES.

2 I love Thee, Jahve my strength,
3 Jahve my rock and my fortress and my Deliverer,
My God, my fastness, wherein I hide myself,
My shield and the horn of my salvation, my high tower!
4 I call upon Jahve as worthy to be praised,
And I am saved from mine enemies.

5 Cords of death had encompassed me,
And floods of the abyss surprised me.
6 Cords of Hades had surrounded me,
Snares of death hurled themselves upon me.
7 In my strait I called upon Jahve,
And unto my God did I cry;
Out of His temple He heard my voice,
And my loud cry before Him came into His ears.

8 Then the earth shook and quaked,
And the foundations of the hills trembled,
And they swung to and fro, for He was wroth.

9 There went up a smoke in His nostrils,
And fire out of His mouth devoured;
Burning coals were set aflame therefrom.
10 Then He bowed the heavens and came down,
And thick darkness was under His feet.

11 And He rode upon the cherub and did fly,
And floated along upon the wings of the wind;
12 He made darkness His covering, His pavilion round about Him,
Darkness of waters, billowy masses of vapour.
13 Out of the brightness before Him there passed through His clouds
Hail-stones and coals of fire.

14 Then Jahve thundered in the heavens,
And the Most High caused His voice to resound.
[Hailstones and coals of fire].
15 And He sent forth His arrows and scattered them,
And lightnings in abundance and confounded them.
16 And the channels of the waters became visible,
And the foundations of the earth were laid bare
At Thy threatening, Jahve,
At the snorting of the breath of Thy wrath.

17 He reached out from on high, He laid hold of me,
Drew me up out of great waters,
Delivered me from my fierce enemy,
And from my haters, because they were too mighty for me.
19 They threw themselves upon me in the day of my calamity,
Then Jahve became my stay,
20 And brought me forth into a broad plain,
Delivered me, for He delighted in me.

21 Jahve dealt with me according to my righteousness,
According to the purity of my hands He recompensed me.
22 For I have observed the ways of Jahve,
And have not wickedly departed from my God.
23 Nay, all His judgments are my aim
And His statutes I do not put away from me,
24 And I was faultless towards Him,
And have kept myself from mine iniquity.

25 So Jahve recompensed me according to my righteousness,
According to the purity of my hands, which was manifest to His eyes.

26 Towards the loving Thou showest Thyself loving,
Towards the man of entire surrender Thou showest Thyself giving;
27 Towards him that purifieth himself Thou showest Thyself pure,
And towards the perverse Thou showest Thyself froward.
26 For Thou, Thou savest afflicted people,
And haughty eyes Thou bringest low.

29 For Thou lightest my lamp:
Jahve, my God, lights up my darkness.
30 For by Thee I crush a troop,
And by my God I leap over a wall.
31 He, God—flawless is His way,
The word of Jahve is tried;
A shield is He unto all that hide themselves in Him.

32 For who is a divine being save Jahve alone,
And who is a rock save our God?
33 The God, who girt me with strength
And made my way void of offence,
34 Making my feet like hinds' feet,
And set me upon my high places,
35 Accustoming my hands to war,
And my arms bent a bow of brass.

36 Yea, Thou gavest me the shield of Thy salvation,
And Thy right hand supported me,
And Thy humility made me great.
37 Thou madest room for my step under me,
And mine ankles have not wavered. |

38 I pursued mine enemies and overtook them,
And turned not back, till I had consumed them.
39 I dashed them to pieces, so that they could not rise,
They fell under my feet.
40 And Thou didst gird me with strength for war,
Thou didst make mine adversaries sink down under me,
41 And Thou didst turn mine enemies' backs to me,
And them that hated me I utterly destroyed.

42 They cried, but there was no helper,
Unto Jahve, but He answered them not.
43 And I crushed them like dust before the wind,
I emptied them out like the mire of the streets.

44 Thou didst set me free from the feuds of the people,
Thou didst set me to be the head of nations;
A people, that I knew not, served me.

45 At the hearing of the ear they obeyed me,
Sons of a foreign country dissembled to me.
The sons of a foreign country withered away
And trembled forth from their holds.

47 Jahve liveth, and blessed be my rock,
And exalted be the God of my salvation,
48 The God that granted me vengeances
And subdued peoples under me,
49 My Deliverer from mine enemies,
Yea, Thou who liftest me up above mine adversaries,
Who dost deliver me from the violent man.

50 Therefore will I praise thee among the nations, Jahve,
And will sing praise unto Thy name,
51 As He who maketh great the fulness of His king's salvation
And showeth grace unto His anointed,
To David and to his seed for ever.

A תְּפִלָּה of David is followed by a שִׁירָה (*nomen unitatis* from שִׁיר), which is interwoven with it in many ways both in its language and thoughts (*Symbolæ*, p. 49). It is the longest of all the hymnic Psalms, and bears the title: *For the Musician, by the servant of Jahve, by David, who spake unto Jahve the words of this song in the day that Jahve had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies and out of the hand of Saul: then he said.* The original title of the Psalm in the primary collection was probably only לדיד ה׳ לעבד למנצח, like that of Ps. xxxvi. As for the rest it runs in the same way as the notes with which such songs are wont to be introduced in historical books (Ex. xv. 1, Num. xxi. 17, and especially Deut. xxxi. 30). And our Psalm is actually to be found once more in 2 Sam. xxii., introduced with words, the agreement of which with the title in the Psalter is manifestly not accidental, an agreement which is explained by the fact that it had been incorporated in one of the historical works from which the Books of Samuel are excerpted, probably the Annals (*Dibre ha-Jamim*) of David. The author of the Books of Samuel has taken the Psalm with that in-

troduction from that work; and it is from it also that the historical part of the title in the Psalter, which is connected with the original title by אֲשֶׁר, is derived.

Just as the Apostles call themselves δοῦλοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, so David also may have called himself עֶבֶד ה׳ in the title. When praying he not unfrequently calls himself Jahve's servant (xix. 12, 14, cxliv. 10; 2 Sam. vii. 20), a name which every Israelite might give to himself, but David, who is after Moses and Joshua the first who receives this epithet, in a special sense. For he, with whom the kingship of promise began, served the people of God in no less epoch-making a manner than Moses, by means of whom they obtained the land of promise.

The technical language of psalm-poetry knows only the term שִׁיר, not שִׁירָה. This of itself shows that the historical part of the title is derived from some other quarter. בְּיוֹם is not followed by the infinitive לְהַצִּיל: on the day of delivering, but more definitely by the *plusquamperfect* הִצִּיל: on the day (בְּיוֹם = at the time, as in Gen. ii. 4 and freq.) when Jahve had delivered—a genitival (Ges., § 116, 3) relative clause, as in cxxxviii. 3, Ex. vi. 28, Num. iii. 1: cf. Ps. lvi. 10. There is no ground for looking upon הִצִּיל as an infinitive form, instead of הַצִּיל (König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 309). Without any other design than that of varying the expression as much as possible, מִיַּד alternates with מִכַּף in the text of the Psalm. Deliverance from the hand of Saul is specially singled out, because the most prominent portion of the Psalm, *vv.* 5–20, treats of it. The danger in which David then found himself was most personal, exceedingly likely to prove fatal to him, and of very long duration. This prominence was of service to the compiler, seeing that the previous Psalm bears the physiognomy of this time, the lamentations over which, that are heard there and further back, now all pour into this ample song of praise.

The Davidic origin of the Psalm is confirmed, as Riehm

also acknowledges, by the fact that it contains nothing contrary to his authorship; even the naming of himself at the close is not against it.[1] We have before us an Israelitish counterpart to the cuneiform inscriptions, in which the kings of the world recapitulate the deeds they have accomplished with the assistance of their gods. The speaker is a king; the author of the Books of Samuel found the song already existing as Davidic; the difference between his text and that of the Psalter shows that even when he wrote, the song had been handed down by tradition for a considerable length of time; here and there writers of the period of the later kings speak in echoes of it (cf. Prov. xxx. 5 with *v.* 31; Hab. iii. 19 with *v.* 34); it bears throughout the mark of the classical period of the language and poetry, and "if it was not written by David, it must have been composed in his name, and by one who was able to transpose himself in thought into his situation and mood; and who could have been this contemporary and equally highly endowed poet?" (Hitz.). Everything points us to David and constrains us to admit his authorship; and it is to him also that all the other songs that are introduced as Davidic in the second Book of Samuel (those referring to Saul and Jonathan, to Abner, etc.) really belong. This, the greatest of them all, has sprung entirely from the new self-consciousness, to which he was raised by the promises in 2 Sam. vii.; towards the end it even expressly refers to these promises; for David's assurance of the eternal duration of his house and of God's gracious covenant with it rests upon the announcement made by Nathan. We find a suitable situation for the composition of the Psalm in 2 Sam. viii. 9–12.

It falls into two halves; for after having completed its

[1] The German mediæval narrative poets are wont to name themselves in the same way at the end of their epics; *e.g.* Wolfram of Eschenbach at the close of *Parzival* and Konrad of Würzburg at the close of his *Otto mit dem Barte*.

first course and found a beautiful close in *v.* 31, the eulogy begins afresh in *v.* 32. These two halves are also different from one another as regards artistic form. The strophe schema of the first is: 6, 8, 8, 6, 8 (not 9), 8, 8, 8, 7. The mixture of six- and eight-line strophes is symmetrical, and the occurrence of seven lines in the last strophe is not surprising. On the other hand, the mixture in the second half is more varied. Here, as elsewhere also in the Psalms, the strophic art appears to flag, and the striving after symmetry in form, with which the poet commenced, seems to have given way to the pressure of the thoughts.

The traditional method of representing this Psalm, as well as the *Cantica* in 2 Sam. xxii. and in Judg. v., in writing is "a half-brick upon a brick and a brick upon a half-brick" (אריח על גבי לבנה ולבנה על גבי אריח): one line consists of two and one of three parts of a verse alternately, and the line consisting of three parts has only one word on the right and on the left; the whole, therefore, forms three columns. According to *Megilla* 16 *b* it is thus that all canticles should be written; and according to *Sofrim*, c. 13, Ps. xviii. has this manner of writing in common with 2 Sam. xxii., whereas the great hymn in Deut. xxxii. (as well as Josh. xii. 9 *ff.*, Esth. ix. 7–10) is to be written "a half-brick upon a half-brick and a brick upon a brick," *i.e.* in only two columns.

Ver. 2–4. The poet preludes by heaping up a number of endearing names of God, in which he eulogistically gathers together the results of long and varied experience. As regards the parallelism of the members, a monostich forms the commencement, as in Pss. xvi., xxiii., xxv., and freq. The matter, however, assumes a somewhat different aspect, if we do not, with Maurer, Hengstenberg and Hupfeld, take *v.* 3 as consisting of two predicating clauses (Jahve is . . . , my God is . . .) but (and this alone corresponds to the intensity of this commencement of the greatest of David's hymns) simply as vocative, God being called upon with יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, אֵלִי, and each

of these divine names being followed by the attributive and ever more sonorous unfolding of its meaning. The אֶרְחָמְךָ (with *ā* according to Ew., § 251 *b*), which governs these three series of divine names, makes up in depth of meaning for what it wants in compass. Elsewhere it is only the *Piel*, רִחַם, that occurs, denoting tender, sympathetic love; here the *Kal* occurs in an Aramaising manner (and therefore the Jalkut on our passage explains it by רחמאי יתך, "I love thee"), denoting ardent, heartfelt love and attachment. In Assyr. also *râmu* (רחם, with weakly aspirated ח, ך, not خ) is the common word for "to love." The most general attributive, חִזְקִי (from חָזָק, inflected in the same manner as אֹמֶר, בֹּקֶר, עֹמְקִי, pl. עֹמְקִי, Prov. ix. 18), is followed by others which describe Jahve on the one hand as a protector and deliverer in times of persecution, and on the other as a defender and giver of victory in battle. They are all names of things, used figuratively, and symbolising what Jahve is in Himself; and, therefore, instead of וּמְפַלְטִי, as it is pointed here, it might perhaps be more correctly וּמְפַלְטִי, "and my refuge" (cf. on the other hand *v.* 49). God has already called Himself a shield when speaking of His relation to Abraham (Gen. xv. 1), and He is already called צוּר (cf. אֱבֶן, Gen. xlix. 24) in the great song of Moses in Deut. xxxii. (*vv.* 4, 37, the latter of which verses is plainly re-echoing here). סֶלַע, from סָלַע, سلع, *findere*, means properly a cleft or chasm in a rock (Arab. صَلْع),[1] then a cleft rock, and צוּר, like the Arab. صَخْر, a hard

[1] *Neśwân* gives the following definition: السلع is a cutting in a mountain after the manner of a gorge or ravine; *Jâḳût*, who mentions a great many places that are so named, defines it thus: a wide plain (فضاء) enclosed by precipitous rocky walls, which one reaches by means of a narrow pass (شعب), and into which one can descend only by scrambling down on foot. Accordingly the idea of a secure (and comfortable) hiding place preponderates in סַלְעִי, that of firm ground and inaccessibility in צוּרִי. The one figure reminds us of the (well-watered)

and huge rock. The figures of the מְצוּדָה (מְצָד, מְצוּדָה) and the מִשְׂגָּב are of a kindred character; the former means either a place of ambush (= intrenchment, fortification, *vid.* Hupf. in *D. M. Z.*, xv. 224), or a place whence one may look out (= watch-tower), and the latter a precipitous height.[1] The figure of the horn, an old figure of victorious offensive might (Deut. xxxiii. 17; 1 Sam. ii. 1), is used here with reference to Jahve Himself: "horn of my salvation" is that which interposes in behalf of my helplessness, overcomes and provides safety for me. All these designations of God are fruits

סֶלַע of Edom, which was surrounded with precipitous rocks (Isa. xvi. 1, xlii. 11), the Πέτρα described by Strabo, xvi. 4, 21; the other reminds us of the Phœnician rocky island צוֹר (*Sûr*), the refuge in the sea.

[1] In Arab. مَصَادٌ means (1) a high hill (a signification not found in Freytag), (2) the summit of a mountain; according to the original lexicons it belongs to the stem مَصَدَ, an opinion that is apparently confirmed by the synonymous forms مَصَّدَ and مَصْعَدَ, as well as by their plurals أَمْصَدَةٌ and مُصْعَدَانٌ, since these could be properly formed from those singulars only on the assumption that the *m* belongs to the root. Seeing, however, that the significations of مَصَدَ all decisively point to its being formed from the root مص, which is contained in the reduplicated stem مَصَّ, to suck, while those of مَصَدٌ, مَصَادٌ and مَصْعَدٌ do not admit of being traced back to it; and seeing, moreover, that there are other instances in which original *nn. loci* from *vv. med.* و and ي either forget or disregard their derivation, and consequently allow the prefixed *m* to be treated as a first radical letter, and with the retention of it form secondary stems (such as مَشَنٌ, مَصَّرٌ, مَدَنٌ, مَكَنٌ, to injure the bladder, مَشَانٌ [cf. the *Samar.* מהך, to go, Gen. xxiv. 56, 65]), it is exceedingly probable that in *maṣâd*, *maṣad*, *maṣd*, we have an original מְצָד, מְצוּדָה, מְצוּדָה, but that these Hebrew words are to be traced back to a צוּד in its primary signification, to spy, look out, and therefore properly mean *specula*. Fleischer.

of the affliction, out of which David's song has sprung, viz. his persecution by Saul, when, living in a country that was rich in caves but poor in respect of forests, he betook himself to rocks, and mountains served him as fortresses. In the refuge, which the mountainous country afforded him in these days, and in the happy accidents which occasionally brought about his deliverance when he was in situations of the very greatest danger, David sees only special manifestations of that which Jahve Himself was to him in the last result. The confession of the God who has authenticated Himself in so many ways is continued in *v.* 4, a statement of a general fact of experience. מְהֻלָּל is an accusative qualifying יְהוָה: I call upon Jahve as one praised (worthy to be praised). Olshausen's rendering: "worthy of praise, I proclaim, is Jahve" is no doubt grammatically possible (*vid.* on Isa. xlv. 24; cf. also Gen. iii. 3, Mic. ii. 6); but ours is to be preferred, for it fits in better with the following clause, which avows the coincidence of the answer with the invocation, which is to be thought of as an appeal for help. The proof that invocation of Him who is worthy to be praised, who, as the history of Israel shows, can and will help, and actual help coincide, forms the purport of the rest of the Psalm.

Vers. 5–7. In *vv.* 5*ff.* David gathers into one general picture all the fearful dangers and marvellous answers and deliverances he had experienced during the time of his persecution by Saul, the invisible, which is related to the visible as cause to effect, making itself visible to him. David seems here to be altogether passive; the hand from out of the clouds lays hold of him and draws him out of great waters; whereas in the second half of the Psalm he appears upon the scene as a free agent, working in fellowship with God and under His blessing. The description begins in *vv.* 5–7 with an account of the danger to which he was exposed, and with his cry for help, which was not in vain. The verb אָפַף does not mean to drive, press, as one might be inclined to think

from the Arabic, but according to a tradition that cannot be called in question (cf. אוֹפָן, a wheel), to revolve, surround, as a poetical synonym of סָבַב, הָקִיף, כָּתַר. Instead of "cords of death" the LXX. (cf. Acts ii. 24) translates ὠδῖνες (pains that draw one together) *θανάτου*; but 6*b* testifies in favour of the meaning "cords" (cf. cxix. 61, where we likewise have חֶבְלֵי instead of חַבְלֵי, which we should naturally expect, Josh. xvii. 5, Job xxxvi. 8); death is therefore thought of as a hunter with a cord and a net (xci. 3). בְּלִיַּעַל, compounded of בְּלִי and יַעַל (from יָעַל, וָעַל, √על), means unprofitableness, worthlessness, and indeed both radical moral depravity and abysmal destruction (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 15, Βελίαρ = Βελίαλ as a name of Satan and his kingdom); streams of destruction are streams whose engulfing floods lead down to the abyss of destruction (Jon. ii. 7). Death, *Belijáal* and *Sheol* are the mysterious powers which made use of David's persecutors as their instruments. Imperfects alternate with preterites as expressing what belongs to the past. קִדֵּם (the primary signification of which is "to come forward") means to advance upon and against one; בָּעַת (= بغت), to fall upon one suddenly (cf. also بعث, to hunt up, to rouse up, *excitare*, to alarm). The הֵיכָל, from which Jahve hears, is His heavenly dwelling place, which is at once palace and temple, inasmuch as, worshipped by the blessed spirits, He is there enthroned. In several MSS. (Wickes, p. 73) the words are accented: וְשַׁוְעָתִי לְפָנָיו; and rightly: my supplication raised, poured forth, before Him (as *e.g.* in cii. 1), for if combined with תָּבוֹא, לְפָנָיו would be tautological seeing that בְּאָזְנָיו is also used. He poured forth his supplication before Jahve's face and his supplication found its way to His ears.

Vers. 8–10. As is now further described, the answer he had received became manifest in the form of deliverance. Universal nature stands in a sympathetic relation towards man, participating as it does in his curse and blessing,

in his corruption and glory; to God it stands in a (so to say) synergetic relationship, announcing His mighty deeds before they come to pass, and bringing them about as the instrumentality that He employs. Accordingly Jahve's interposition in behalf of David is represented here as being accompanied by terrible natural phenomena. Like the deliverance of Israel from Egypt (Pss. lxviii., lxxvii.) and the giving of the law from Sinai (Ex. xix), like the final Parousia of Jahve and of Jesus Christ according to the word of prophet and apostle (Hab. iii., 2 Thess. i. 7*f.*), so also the appearing of Jahve in behalf of David has extraordinary natural phenomena in its train. It is true we are not expressly informed of any incident in the life of David like that recorded in 1 Sam. vii. 10; but it must be an actual experience that David idealises here, *i.e.* apprehends in its root-idea and generalizes into a grand majestic picture of his miraculous deliverance. Amidst earthquake a black thunder-storm gathers, the charging of which announces itself in flashes of lightning, and whose mass of clouds is descending nearer and nearer to the earth. The aorists in *v.* 8 introduce the event, for which everything has been preparing, and towards which everything has been working up, from *v.* 4 onwards. The inward excitement of the Judge, who appears to deliver His servant, sets the earth in violent oscillations. The foundations of the mountains (Isa. xxiv. 18) are that upon which they are based beneath and by means of which they are held compactly together within, the piers and columns, as it were, that support these huge masses. געשׁ (rhyming with רעשׁ) is followed by its *Hithpael:* the impulse to oscillate having once been communicated to them, they, viz. the earth and the pillars of the mountains, continue this oscillating movement of themselves. All this takes place because God is wroth; there is no need to supply אַפּוֹ; חָרָה לוֹ is synonymous with חַם לוֹ. When God is wroth, then, according to the Old Testament concep-

tion, the power of wrath that exists within Him is kindled and blazes up and breaks forth. The fuming that accompanies wrath may, therefore, be also called the smoke of the fire of wrath (lxxiv. 1, lxxx. 5); smoking is, as it were, an exhalation of the fire; and the vehement, hot breath, which comes in and passes out through the nose of the wrathful person (cf. Job xli. 12) is like smoke that rises up from an internal fire of wrath. The fire of wrath itself "devours from out of the mouth," *i.e.* devouring everything it lays hold of, it flames forth from the mouth,—with man, in angry words, but with God, in fiery forces of nature, forces that are homogeneous with His wrath and that are taken into its service, and more especially in the fire of the lightning's flash. It is primarily the lightning that is compared here to the blazing up of burning coals (גֶּחָלִים from גַּחַלֶת, גַּחֶלֶת = جَحِيم, the word in the Koran for hell-fire). When the wrath that is potential in God becomes actual, it glows, and ere it entirely discharges its fire, it announces itself after the manner of a corposant. Thus wroth and causing His anger to flash forth, Jahve bowed the heavens, *i.e.* let them down towards the earth and descended, and a dark mass of clouds (עֲרָפֶל, synon. with ὄρφνη; cf. ἔρεβος) was under His feet: black, low-hanging clouds announced that He was in the act of descending in His wrath to make His power felt upon the earth.

Vers. 11–13. The tempest which announced the thunderstorm that was soon to burst upon the earth was also at the same time a harbinger of the avenger and deliverer. If we compare *v.* 11 with civ. 3, it is natural to look upon כְּרוּב as a transposition of רְכוּב (a chariot, Ew., § 153 *a*); on the presupposition, however, of the kinship of the *Cherub* of the Bible and the (according to Ktesias) Indo-Persian griffin, the word (from the Zend *grab*, *garew*, *garefsh*, to seize) means the being which seizes, and being unapproachable holds fast

whatever it seizes; in the Semitic family of languages it means, after the analogy of the Assyrian *karûbu*, which is cited as a synonym of *rubû*, the august or powerful; *kirûbu* is a name of the godhead represented as a winged bull; *kirûbu damḳu*, the gracious Cherub, and *šêdu damḳu*, the gracious bull-god (*šêdu*, synon. with *alpu*), alternate with one another.[1] At any rate, there is a connection between the Cherub as described by Ezekiel (cf. x. 14, where כרוב seems to be directly equivalent to שׁור) and the Babylonian winged bulls in the entrances to the temples and palaces. But where the Cherubim are mentioned outside of Ezekiel (and apart from the four ζῶα of the Book of Revelation), the notion of their being in the form of a bull is remote. In Gen. iii. 24 they appear as the guards of Paradise, and elsewhere as the living strong wall and chariot of the unapproachable majesty of God—they are the media not only in general of God's presence in the world, but also in particular of the presence of the God who turns the fiery side of His doxa towards the world. As in the Prometheus of Æschylus Oceanos comes flying *τὸν πτερυγωκῆ τόνδ' οἰωνὸν γνώμᾳ στομίων ἄτερ εὐθύνων*, so Jahve rides here upon the Cherub, or if we understand David in accordance with Ezekiel (comparing also such passages as Ps. civ. 3, and Isa. lxvi. 15), He drives thereupon as His living throne-chariot (מֶרְכָּבָה, 1 Chron. xxviii. 18).[2] The throne floats upon the Cherubim, and this cherub-throne floats upon the wings of the wind; or, as we may also say: the Cherub is the heavenly and spiritual element

[1] *Vid.* Friedrich Delitzsch, *Paradies*, pp. 150–155.

[2] Kliefoth, who rejects the notion of the Cherubim being the throne-chariot of God, goes so far as to find that the passage in Sirach xlviii. 8 is apocryphal: "Sirach is the first who has read out of the words of Ezekiel a chariot of Cherubim (*ἅρμα χερουβίμ*)." The Cherubim are the bearers of the throne, and in fact, as the אופנים show, of the throne-chariot, of God, not indeed, according to Ezekiel, of God in His gracious presence, but in the manifestation of Himself in His majesty as Judge.

within this spirit-like elemental vehicle. The conductor of the throne-chariot is Himself invisible behind thick thunder clouds. רָכַב combines the meanings, to drive, and to ride. יָּשֶׂת is an aorist without ו consecutive (cf. יָהּ, Hos. vi. 1). The accusative of the object to it is חֹשֶׁךְ; and there is a twofold accusative of the predicate: His covering, His pavilion round about Him. In Job xxxvi. 29 also the thundercloud is called God's סֻכָּה, and in xcvii. 2 also it is סְבִיבָיו, withdrawing Him from men's eyes on all sides and only indicating His presence in wrath. In 12 *b* the accusative of the object, חֹשֶׁךְ, is expanded: darkness of waters, *i.e.* darkness abounding in waters,[1] and billowy masses of vapour, thick and, therefore, dark masses (עָב, in its primary signification, that which is dense, compact, or a thicket, Ex. xix. 9; cf. Jer. iv. 29) of שְׁחָקִים, which is here a poetical name of fleecy clouds. According to *v.* 13, the dispersion and discharge of the contents of these clouds proceeded from נֹגַהּ נֶגְדּוֹ. This name is given to God's doxa (Ezek. x. 4) as being a reflection of His substance, a reflection which is, as it were, over against Him, as being, therefore, His express image. The doxa is fire and light. On this occasion there issue forth from it forces of wrath and therefore of fire: crashing hail (cf. Isa. xxx. 30) and fiery glowing coals, *i.e.* flashes of lightning that scintillate and set aflame the objects which they strike (cf. Hab. iii. 11).[2] The object, עָבָיו, precedes the verb, because with the doxa there is primarily associated the idea of the clouds, behind which, according to *v.* 11 (cf. Hab. iii. 4), it is concealed. We might also interpret it: before His resplendence His clouds turn into hail . . . , which

[1] For the explanation of these words, Rab Dimi (*Taanîth*, 10 *a*) cites a Palestinian proverb: נהור ענני זעירין מוהי חשוך ענני סגיין מוהי, *i.e.* if the clouds are transparent, they give little water; if, however, they are dark, they give much.

[2] The Phœnician Ζεὺς Κεραύνιος has the epithet רצף (*pruna*) or רשף (*fulgur*); *vid.* Baudissin, *Jahve et Moloch* (1874), p. 43.

would be more conformable to the structure of the stichoi, and is really possible according to Ges., 138, rem. 2. Still, when עבר and clouds are connected together, the idea most readily suggested is that of passing through (Lam. iii. 44). Riehm understands עָבְרוּ after the analogy of Job xxx. 15, as denoting the disappearance of the clouds before the brilliancy of light that is produced by the successive flashes. But in that case ברד וגחלי־אֵשׁ would stand by itself and without any connection with עברו, a construction which there is nothing compelling us to assume. The striking out of עביו is very far indeed from commending itself to us. The verse would thereby, like 2 Sam. xxii. 13, lose the necessary symmetry.

Vers. 14–16. Amid thunder Jahve hurled lightnings like arrows upon David's foes, and the breath of His anger laid bare the beds of the rivers even to the centre of the earth, in order to deliver the submerged one. The thunder is God's threatening voice and, as it were, the hollow murmuring of His mouth (Job xxxvii. 2). God is here called עֶלְיוֹן, the Most High, as being the unapproachable Judge who governs all things. The third line of *v.* 14 is erroneously repeated out of the preceding strophe; it does not admit of being justified grammatically by Ex. ix. 23, seeing that נָתַן קוֹל, *edere vocem*, does not have the same meaning as נָתַן קֹלֹת, *dare tonitrua*, there; it has also the symmetry of the structure of the strophes against it and is wanting in 2 Sam. and in the LXX. רָב is parallel to וַיְשַׁלַּח; as the opposite of מְעַט (Neh. ii. 12, Isa. x. 7) it means adverbially "in abundance." It is generally taken after Gen. xlix. 23 in the sense of בָּרַק in cxliv. 6: the explanation given being that רָב in pause = רׇב (the *ō* passing over into the broader *â*, like עָז for עֹז in Gen. xlix. 3) = רָבַב, cognate with רָבָה, רָמָה; but the existence of the forms סָב, סָבוּ, is questionable here and everywhere else; *e.g.* רַב in Isa. liv. 13 is rather an adjective than the third person *præt.* (Böttcher, *Neue Aehrenlese*, No. 635, 1066, cf. 1350). The suffixes *ēm* do not refer to the arrows, *i.e.* the lightnings,

but to David's foes. הָמַם means both to confuse, embarrass, and to destroy by putting into a state of confusion (Ex. xiv. 24, xxiii. 27). Besides the thunder, the voice of Jahve, there comes also a hurricane, which is the snorting of the breath of His nostrils. This causes the beds of the waters to become visible and the foundations of the earth to be laid bare: אֲפִיק (a secondary form of אָפֵק) is the bed of a river and then the river or brook itself, *a continendo aquas* (Ges.); we have a similar designation of the bed of a stream or river, and then, *metonymiâ continentis pro contento*, of the water itself in بَحْر, which signifies "the fissure" (the basin of the sea), and then "the sea," also in وَاد (الوادى), which means the valley that stretches along, then also the river that flows through a valley, and then river in general. Jahve needs only to threaten (ἐπιτιμᾶν, Matt. viii. 26), and the floods, in which he who is to be rescued is submerged, flee (civ. 7) and dry up (cvi. 9, Nah. i. 4). He is already, however, half in the abyss of Hades; and therefore not only is the bed of the river disclosed to view, but the earth itself is cloven to its very centre. That we were right in interpreting the description as ideal, is clear from the circumstance that it becomes directly allegorical here. He who is well nigh overcome by foes is represented as one who is submerged in deep waters and almost drowned.

Vers. 17–20. Then Jahve stretches forth His hand from on high into the deep chasm and draws up the sinking one. The verb שָׁלַח occurs also in prose (2 Sam. vi. 6) without יָד (lvii. 4; cf. on the other hand the borrowed passage, cxliv. 7) in the signification to reach (after anything); the verb מָשָׁה, however, appears elsewhere only in Ex. ii. 10, and there as the root of the name of Moses (a translation of his Egyptian name into Hebrew); Luther found in it an historical allusion: "He has made a Moses of me," has drawn me up out of great (many) waters, which had already almost

entirely swallowed me up, just as He drew up Moses out of the waters of the Nile, in which he would otherwise have perished. The figurative language is followed in *v.* 18 by its interpretation, just as in cxliv. 7 the "great waters" are explained by מִיַּד בְּנֵי נֵכָר, an interpretation that is not suitable here, or which is at least too narrow.

With *v.* 17 the hymn has reached the climax of epic description, from which it now moves downwards in a tone that becomes more and more lyrical. In the combination אֹיְבִי עָז, עָז is not an adverbial accusative, but an adjective like רוּחֲךָ טוֹבָה (cxliii. 10) and ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός (*Hebräerbr.*, p. 353). With כִּי the interposition of the divine omnipotence is grounded upon the superiority of the foes and the impotence of the one whose life is threatened. On the day of his אֵיד, *i.e.* (*vid.* on xxxi. 12) trouble or calamity, when he was moreover a homeless and almost defenceless fugitive, they fell upon him (קִדְּמוּנִי as in 6 *b*, xvii. 13), cutting off all possibility of his delivering himself; but Jahve became the staff (xxiii. 4) of the wanderer, supported by which he held himself erect. The reading יְקַדְּמֻנִי (after lix. 11) is excluded by 19 *b*, which demands antithetical parallelism. Thus then he has been brought by God's hand out of straits and difficulties into a broad place, out of the prison of oppression into freedom; for Jahve delighted in him; he was His elect and His beloved. חָפֵץ has here the accent upon the penult; it also has *Metheg*, as a sign of lengthening (הֶעֱמָדָה), by the *ē*, so that we may not read *ĕ*.[1] The following strophe tells us why it was that he was pleasing to God and why God did not allow him to perish. That כִּי חָפֵץ בִּי now becomes the principal thought of the hymn.

Vers. 21–24. On גָּמַל (like שִׁלַּם, with an accusative not merely of the thing but also of the person, *e.g.* in 1 Sam.

[1] In like manner *Metheg* stands by the *ē* of the final shut syllable, that has lost the tone through its having been drawn further back, in חָפֵץ xxii. 9; וַתְּחוֹלְלֵנִי, xc. 2; *vid.* on Isa. xl. 7 *f.*, lxii. 2 and freq.

xxiv. 18), εὖ or κακῶς πράττειν τινά, *vid.* on vii. 5. שָׁמַר, to observe = to keep, is used in the same way in Job xxii. 15. רִשְׁעַ מִן is a pregnant way of expressing *malitiosa desertio;* "on God's side," *i.e.* in His judgment, would be contrary to the usage of the language (for the מִן of Job iv. 17 is meant in a different sense) and would form a frigid adjunct. *V.* 23 has a Deuteronomic colouring (Deut. vi. 2, vii. 11, viii. 11). On the poetical מִנִּי, in pause מָנִּי, *vid.* Ew., § 263 *b*. The *impf.* in *v.* 23 *b*, occurring as it does alongside of the noun-clause 23 *a*, is not meant to denote what he was wont to do in the past, but what he is wont to do at the present time: he has not wickedly forsaken his God, but (כִּי = *imo, sed*) has God's commandments always before him as a norm, and does not put them far away from his sight, in order that he may be able to sin the more shamelessly; and the consequence was (*impf. consec.*) that he was תָּמִים in relation (עִם as in Deut. xviii. 13; cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5) to God (*i.e.* his whole heart was undividedly directed towards God, fixed upon Him) and kept himself from his iniquity (עָוֹן, from עָוָה, عوى, to twist, pervert; cf. عوى, said of error, delusion, hallucination), *i.e.*, not from acquiescing in his indwelling sin, but from allowing iniquity to become his own; מֵעֲוֹנִי being equivalent to מֵעֲוֹתִי (Dan. ix. 5); cf. מֵחַטָּאתִי (Prov. xx. 9) and מִחַיָּי = than that I should live (Jon. iv. 8). In this strophe the tone of Ps. xviii. becomes similar to that of Ps. xvii., which it therefore immediately follows. We may compare David's testimony to himself in 1 Sam. xxvi. 23 *f.*, the testimony of God in 1 Kings xiv. 8, and the testimony of history in 1 Kings xv. 5, xi. 4.

Vers. 25–28. That which was already stated in *v.* 21 is once more expressed here as the result of his upright walk described in *vv.* 22–24 and substantiated in *vv.* 26, 27. חָסִיד is the friend of God and man, just as *pius* is said of one's behaviour towards man as well as towards God; גֶּבֶר תָּמִים, the man (construct of גֶּבֶר) of ethico-religious in-

tegrity (*integri = integritatis;* cf. xv. 2), *i.e.* of undivided consecration to God; נָקִי (instead of which בַּר לֵבָב is used elsewhere, xxiv. 4, lxxiii. 1), not the purified one, but (in accordance with the primary reflexive signification of the *Niph.*) the man that purifies himself (*ἁγνίζων ἑαυτόν*, 1 John iii. 3); עִקֵּשׁ (the opposite of יָשָׁר), the man who is morally distorted, the man of perverse mind. Freely formed *Hithpaels* are used along with these adjectives in order to express the corresponding self-manifestation of God towards those so described, viz. הִתַּמֵּם, הִתְחַסֵּד (Ges., § 54, 2 *b*), הִתְבָּרֵר and הִתְפַּתֵּל (to show one's self נִפְתָּל or פִּתַּלְתָּל). God requites the ardent love of the godly man with cordial love, the entire surrender of the upright man with a full communication of grace, the striving after purity with an unreservedly loving mind (cf. lxxiii. 1), moral self-perversion with paradoxical judgments, by giving the perverse man over to his perverseness (Rom. i. 28) and leading him by strange ways to final damnation (Isa. xxix. 14; cf. Lev. xxvi. 23 *f.*). The truth expressed here is not that the notion which man forms of God is the reflection of his own inner nature, but that God's behaviour towards man is the reflection of the relation in which man has placed himself to Him (cf. 1 Sam. ii. 30, xv. 23). This general truth is illustrated and substantiated in *v.* 28. The Church bowed down with affliction experiences God's condescension in order to its salvation, and its haughty oppressors experience God's exaltation to their humiliation. Lofty, haughty eyes are, according to Prov. vi. 17, among the seven things which Jahve hateth. God's judgment compels them to humble themselves with shame (Isa. ii. 11).

Vers. 29–31. The substantiation of this general truth is continued, David applying that which has been said to himself. Hitzig translates the *impff.* in *v.* 29 *f.* as referring to the past; but the sequence of tenses that would render such a translation necessary is interrupted here, just as it

has already been interrupted in *v.* 28, by כִּי. The lamp, נֵר (contracted from *nawir*), is an image of life, which as it were burns on, the idea of a state of prosperity and of high rank being also included in it; in the form נִיר (contracted from *niwr*, *nijr*) it is the usual figurative expression for the continuance of David's house (1 Kings xi. 36 and freq.). The life and rule of David as the one called by God to be king is the lamp which God's grace has lighted for the good of Israel, and His power does not permit this lamp to be quenched (2 Sam. xxi. 17); the darkness which descends upon David and his house is always lit up again by Jahve. For His strength is mighty in the weak one; in, with and through Him he can do all things. The *impf.* אָרֹץ may be derived from רָצַץ (=אָרַץ) with all the more certainty, as this verb has the vowel *u* in the *impf.* also in Isa. xlii. 4, and in Eccles. xii. 6; the text of 2 Sam. xxii., however, certainly seems to have "running upon" instead of "breaking down." The wall receives its name שׁוּר from the fact of its having to be scaled in order that one may get over it (cf. سار *fut. o*, to mount up, ascend, just as wine mounts up into one's head and takes possession of it). With *v.* 31 the first half of the hymn closes after the manner of an epiphone. הָאֵל is *nom. abs.*, like הַצּוּר in Deut. xxxii. 4; this old Mosaic utterance re-echoes here, as in 2 Sam. vii. 22, in David's mouth. The article of הָאֵל points to the God who is revealed in history. His way is flawless and blameless. His word is צְרוּפָה, not drossy ore, but refined and pure gold (xii. 7). Whoever betakes himself to Him, the God of promise, is shielded from every danger. Prov. xxx. 5 is borrowed from this passage.

Vers. 32–35. The laudatory description of the grace he has experienced takes a new flight and is continued in this second half, in which the mixture of the strophes is more varied and irregular. That which was stated in *v.* 31 regarding Jahve's way and word and Jahve Himself is con-

firmed in *v.* 32 by the fact, that He alone is אֱלוֹהַּ, a divine being to be reverenced, and that He alone is צוּר, a rock, *i.e.* an immoveable ground of confidence; that which was asserted in *v.* 31 applies, therefore, only to Him. מִבַּלְעֲדֵי (with מִן intensifying the negation in בלעדי), "without reference to" and then simply "besides," alternates with זוּלָתִי (with the connecting vowel *î*, which elsewhere discharges also the function of a suffix), from זוּלַת (זוּלָה), "exception." What follows is connected descriptively with אֱלֹהֵינוּ: our God (*i.e.* the God of Israel), the God, who girt me with strength (חַיִל, like חוֹל, with the root-idea of turning, bending), and consequently (*impf. consec.*) rendered my way תָּמִים, "perfect," *i.e.* absolutely inoffensive, free from stumblings and offences, leading directly to a goal in accordance with the mind of God; the idea here is the same as in *v.* 31 (cf. Job xxii. 3) and is therefore no mere physical idea (Hupf., Riehm); the only difference is that the flawlessness is to be understood here in accordance with its reference to the way of a man, a king, a warrior; cf. moreover, the other text. The verb שָׁוָה means, like سوّى, to make level (*æquare*), to arrange, set right; the borrowed passage, Hab. iii. 19, has instead the more colourless שִׂים. The hind, אַיָּלָה or אַיֶּלֶת, is the paragon of swiftness (cf. ἔλαφος and ἐλαφρός) and at the same time of gracefulness in the animal world. "Like the hinds" is equivalent to "like the hinds' feet"; the Hebrew style leaves it to the reader himself to infer the salient point of the comparison from the figure. What is meant is not swiftness in flight (de Wette), but in attacking and pursuing—one of the qualities of a hero according to 2 Sam. i. 23; ii. 18; 1 Chron. xii. 8. "My high places": David does not give this name to the heights of the enemy which become his by means of conquest, but to the heights of the holy land, which belonged to him as king of Israel: Jahve vouchsafed to him a firm footing upon them, so that from them he rules the land far and wide

and holds them victoriously (cf. passages like Deut. xxxii. 13, Isa. lviii. 14). The verb לִמֵּד, which is usually construed with a double accusative, is combined here with ל referring to the subject taught as the aim of the teaching. The subject, "my arms," is preceded by the verb נָחַת (to press down = to bend the bow) in the singular; even when the subject stands first this inequality is admissible (*e.g.* in Gen. xlix. 22, Joel i. 20, Zech. vi. 14.) קֶשֶׁת נְחוּשָׁה, a bow of brass, *i.e.* of bronze, as in Job xx. 24. To press down and bend with the hand a brazen bow, one end of which rests upon the ground, is a custom of heroes also in Homer and in Ramâjana.

Vers. 36, 37. That, however, which makes him victorious, is not the brazen bow by itself, but the helping strength of his God. The "shield of Thy salvation" is the shield consisting in Thy salvation; as everywhere else מָגֵן has unchangeable *â*. Jahve's salvation covered him like a shield, from which every blow of the enemy rebounded; Jahve's right hand supported him, so that his hands did not become weak in battle;—in the last analysis it is the divine עֲנָוָה, to which he has to trace back his greatness: not the humility which God has wrought in him (Aben Ezra), but God's own humility (Raschi), in virtue of which His eyes look down to behold that which is on the earth (cxiii. 6), and the poor and those who grieve deeply are His most loved dwelling-place (Isa. lvii. 15, lxvi. 1 *f.*; cf. *Megilla* 31 *a*: "wherever Scripture testifies of the sovereign might, גבורה of the Holy One, blessed be He, it gives prominence also to His condescension, עַנְוָתָנוּתוֹ, as in Deut. x. 17 and *v.* 18, Isa. lviii. 15 *a* and 15 *b*, Ps. lxviii. 5 and 6"). Raschi's interpretation: Thy condescension Thou makest great to me (Thou dost manifest towards me richly), would commend itself, if the suffix of תַּרְבֵּנִי did not admit of being taken appropriately as an object. The LXX., Theod., Syr., and Jerome render it: *disciplina tua*, as if it were עַנְוָתְךָ; Luther also translates it in accordance with this interpretation:

"when Thou humblest me, Thou makest me great"; but עַנְוָה is the bowing down of one's self, not of another. What is meant is that condescension of God to humanity, and more especially to David's house, which, leading up to the goal of the Incarnation, actuated itself in the life of the son of Jesse from the time of his anointing onwards till his death-bed, the divine χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία (Tit. iii. 4), which selected the shepherd boy to be king, and even when he fell into sin, and his infirmities became manifest, did not cast him off. To enlarge one's steps under one is equivalent to providing a traveller free space wherein to move (cf. the antithesis in Prov. iv. 12). Jahve removed all obstacles out of his way, and steeled his ankles so that he stood his ground in battle, and held out in a victorious course. The perfect מעדו confirms what the *consec. temporum* of itself demands, that everything here is meant retrospectively.

Vers. 38–41 So fighting in God's strength, with God's weapons, and with God's assistance, he smote, overthrew, destroyed all his enemies both in foreign and in civil wars. According to Hebrew syntax everything here is retrospective. The reference of the *impff.* in *vv.* 38, 39 to the past is clear from the aorist which comes in in *v.* 40, and from the perfects and imperfects in its train. The strophe begins with an echo of Ex. xv. 5 (cf. *supra* vii. 6). The poet calls his opponents קָמַי, as in *v.* 49, xliv. 6, lxxiv. 23 (cf. קָיְמָנוּ, Job xxii. 20), קוּם by itself having already the meaning, to rise up hostilely, and therefore קָמַי can be said instead of קָמִים עָלַי (קוֹמִים, 2 Kings xvi. 7).[1] That קום in 39 *a* does not mean "to stand (to continue, subsist)," but "to rise (again)," is shown by the frequent use of this phrase (*e.g.* in xxxvi.

[1] In the language of the Bedouin *ḥôm* is state of war, feud, and *ḥômānî* (denominative from *ḥôm*) my enemy (*hostis*); *ḥôm* has also the signification of a collective from *ḥômānî*, and one may say equally well: *entum wa-ijânâ ḥôm*, you and we are enemies, and: *bênâtnâ ḥôm*, there is war between us.

13, Lam. i. 14). The phrase נָתַן עֹרֶף, however, which usually has the fugitives as its subject (2 Chron. xxix. 6), has a different turn given to it here: mine enemies Thou gavest, didst set, madest to me a back, *i.e.* madest them turn back, as in Ex. xxiii. 27. From xxi. 13 (תְּשִׁיתֵמוֹ שְׁכֶם, Symm. *τάξεις αὐτοὺς ἀποστρόφους*) it is clear that עֹרֶף is not an acusative of the member in addition to the accusative of the person (as *e.g.* in Deut. xxxiii. 11), but a factitive object according to Ges., § 139, 2.

Vers. 42, 43. Their prayer to their gods, and even to Jahve, which was wrung from them by their need, was in vain, because for their own cause and addressed too late to Him. עַל = אֶל; the two prepositions alternate in xlii. 2. Seeing that we do not pulverize dust, but to dust, כְּעָפָר is to be taken as describing the result: so that they became like dust (cf. Job xxxviii. 30, כָּאֶבֶן, so that it became like a stone, and the *non plus ultra* of such pregnant brevity in Isa. xli. 2) before the wind (עַל־פְּנֵי as in 2 Chron. iii. 17, before the face). The second figure is to be taken otherwise: I emptied them out (אֲרִיקֵם from הֲרִיק) like the mire of the street, *i.e.* as when one empties out what does not deserve anything better than to become mire of the street; so contemptuously, so ignominiously, and so completely did I empty them out (cf. Isa. x. 6, Zech. x. 5); the LXX. renders λεανῶ, from הֲרֵק (√רק, to stretch, make thin, cf. *tendo*, *tenuis*, and *dehnen*, to stretch, and *dünn*, thin), and the text of 2 Sam. xxii. presents the same idea in its אֲרִיקֵם.

Vers. 44–46. Thus victorious in God, David became what he now is: ruler of a great kingdom firmly established both within and without. In view of the following גּוֹיִם and the verb תְּפַלְּטֵנִי, we can understand by the רִיבֵי עָם only the conflicts among his own people, in which David became involved through the persecution of Saul and the rebellions of Absalom and of Sheba the son of Bichri, and from which Jahve delivered him, in order to preserve him for his calling

of universal dominion in conformity with promise. The expression is similar to בְּרִית עָם in Isa. xlix. 8 and קְנָאַת־עָם in Isa. xxvi. 11 (*vid.* my Commentary on both these passages), whereas the attributive לֹא־יָדַעְתִּי (Ges., § 123, 3) gives to the second עַם in our passage a reference to foreign nations. The arguments, by which Riehm maintains that ריבי עם means conflicts with other nations, do not stand the test; national feuds are *bella civilia*. The *Niph.*, נִשְׁמַע, in *v.* 45 is the reflexive of שָׁמַע to obey (*e.g.* Ex. xxiv. 7) and is therefore to be rendered: to show themselves obedient (= *Ithpa.* Dan. vii. 27); לִשְׁמַע אָזֶן implies more than that they obeyed at his word; שֵׁמַע means intelligence, news, rumour, and שְׁמַע אֹזֶן is the antithesis of what one sees with one's own eyes (Job xlii. 5); accordingly we must render the clause: they submitted even at the hearsay of my victories, of which we have an instance in 2 Sam. viii. 9*f.* כָּחַשׁ, to deny, to lie, to dissemble, said here, as frequently, of the enforced submission, which the vanquished show to the victor. *V.* 45 describes how it came about that the sons of the foreign country put a good face on a bad business. They withered away, *i.e.* became weak and languid (Ex. xviii. 18), unable to hold out against David's siege or to break through it, and, surrendering at discretion, trembled forth out of their wards, *i.e.* out of the strongholds behind which they had shut themselves up (cf. cxlii. 8). By means of the Arabic حَرِجَ (√حر, said of audible pressing, squeezing and the like), to be pressed, squeezed, tight, strait, to come into a dilemma (whence also حرك, *movere*, literally, to give a thing an impulse to move by pressing against it) and the Targumic אִיכְמְתָא דמותא = חַרְגָּא דְמוֹתָא (*vid.* the Targums on Deut. xxxii. 25), the signification "to be alarmed" is secured to the verb חָרַג, a signification which is specialised here by means of מִן local, which is combined with it, into that of anxious flight.

The LXX. renders it by καὶ ἐχώλαναν, as if it were יחגרו as in 2 Sam. xxii. It is more natural to compare the Arabic خرج, to go forth, than حجل, to limp, to halt (Hitz.), for חרג; but the meaning is too colourless for our passage, and moreover, in this signification at least, the verb is not biblical Hebrew. The יַרְגְּזוּ of the borrowed passage (Mic. vii. 17) favours our interpretation.

Vers. 47–49. The hymn now draws to a close with strains of praise and thanksgiving for the rich fulness of glorious divine deeds that has just been unfolded. Like (צוּרִי) בָּרוּךְ (*part. pass.* to בָּרַךְ; *vid.* on xcv. 6), which is everywhere doxological, so חי ה׳ (*vivus Jahve*) also is conceived of as a declaratory clause; it is pronounced, however, in exactly the same manner as when it is used as an oath, viz. with the accent of an exclamation; and here it has a doxological sense. Accordingly וְיָרוּם also means: let Him be or become exalted, in which sense the other text writes וירם (וְיָרֹם = וְיָרֻם). There are three doxological declarations, drawn from the events that have just been sung. That which follows from הָאֵל onwards characterizes Jahve once more as the living, blessed (εὐλογητόν) and exalted One, which He has proved Himself to be. From וַיַּדְבֵּר we see that הַנּוֹתֵן refers to the past. The manifestations of vengeance, נְקָמוֹת, are called God's gift, inasmuch as it was He that made him able to punish the attacks upon the dignity that belonged to himself and his people in conformity with their calling, or to see their punishment (*e.g.* in the case of Nabal); for divine vengeance is a vindication of the inviolability of right by means of penal consequences. For וַיַּדְבֵּר (here and xlvii. 4) we do not need the Arabic دبر, to turn the back, to cause to turn; for even without its assistance the idea of subduing follows by means of the intermediate notion of flight (as if it were וַיַּסֵּב אָחוֹר) from the root idea *agere*, whence the *Hiph.* has the intensive signification *cogere* (to compel) and *subigere* (to

subdue).[1] Such figures as that of the footstool (ex. 1) or of passing over (cxxix. 3, Isa. li. 23) are combined with תַּחְתָּי. In מְפַלְטִי the language assumes the form of an address o God. רוֹמֵם מִן is not to be interpreted in any other way than in ix. 14: Thou liftest me up away from mine adversaries, so that I soar above them and overcome them. The emphasizing אַף, of which poetry is fond, unites two thoughts here of the same purport, so that the expression of the one idea is more emphatic. The participle is followed by imperfects: that which has been experienced on several occasions is reduced to one general ideal expression.

Vers. 50, 51. The praise of such a God, who acts towards David in accordance with His promise to him, is not to remain confined within the narrow territory of Israel. When the anointed of God makes war upon the heathen with the sword, it is, after all, the blessing of the knowledge of Jahve, for which he breaks a path in this way, and the salvation of Jahve, which he mediatorially subserves. In Rom. xv. 9 Paul quotes (and that, too, with perfect right) *v.* 50 of our Psalm along with Deut. xxxii. 43 and Ps. cxvii. 1 as a proof that, according to the divine compassion, salvation belongs also to the Gentiles. That which *v.* 51 assigns as the ground and matter of the praise and thanks that resound beyond Israel, is, as Hitzig and Riehm acknowledge, an echo of the Messianic promises in 2 Sam. vii. 12–16 which is perfectly compatible with David's authorship. In Christ, the son of David, David's fallen throne has lasting continuance, and in Him everything that was promised to David's seed has eternal truth and reality. According to its final purport, the praise of Jahve, the God of David, His anointed, is praise of the Father of Jesus Christ.

[1] In Assyrian, the *Piël* of *dabâru*, as an independent stem, means to take, snatch, away.

Psalm xviii According to the Text of 2 Sam. xxii.

On the differences as regards the title, *vid.* on xviii. 1. The relation of the prose accentuation of the Psalm in 2 Sam. xxii. to the poetical accentuation in the psalter is instructive; *e.g* instead of *Mercha mahpach* (*Olewejored*) in the psalter we have here *Athnach;* instead of the *Athnach* which follows *Mercha mahpach*, we have here *Zakef* (cf. xviii. 7, 16, 31 with 2 Sam. xxii. 7, 16, 31); instead of *Rebia mugrasch*, we have here *Tifcha* (cf. xviii. 4 with 2 Sam. xxii. 4) and instead of *Pazer* at the beginning of a verse, here *Athnach* (cf. Ps. xviii. 2 with 2 Sam. xxii. 2).

Vers. 2–4. This strophe is mangled by the omission of its monostichic introit (xviii. 2), possibly on account of the highly poetical and not generally understood Aramaism. In consequence of this the vocatives in *v.* 2*f.* are deprived of their support and reduced to noun-clauses: "Jahve is my rock, etc.," which do not form a true hymnic commencement. Instead of וּמְפַלְטִי we find, as in cxliv. 2, ומפלטי־לי; instead of אֱלֹהֵי צוּרִי, אֵלִי צוּרִי, which is contrary to the character of this series of emblematical names. The damage done to the strophe is made up by the addition: "and my refuge, my Saviour, who saveth me from violence." In *v.* 4*b*, as well as in 49*b*, the non-assimilated מִן (cf. *v.* 14, xxx. 4, lxxiii. 19) is abbreviated into an assimilated one. Is לִי perhaps a remnant of the obliterated אֵלִי, and אֱלֹהֵי an attempt at clothing the צוּרִי which was then too naked?

Vers. 5–7. The connection of this strophe with the previous one by means of כִּי is in accordance with the sense, but tame. On the other hand, the reading מִשְׁבְּרֵי instead of חֶבְלֵי (even supposing the author of cxvi. 3 to have read the latter) commends itself by the parallelism, and also by the fact that, adopting it, the latter figurative expression is not repeated in *vv.* 5 and 6, as it is in our present text. מִשְׁבְּרֵי are not necessarily waves that break upon the shore, but also waves

that break upon one another, and therefore אֲפָפוּנִי is not unsuitable. The ו of וַנַּחֲלֵי, which can be dispensed with, is omitted. Instead of the form סַבָּבוּנִי, which is more sonorous and also more proportionate to the closing fall of the verse, we have the less common syncopated form סַבּוּנִי (cf. cxviii. 11). The repetition of אֶקְרָא (instead of אֶשְׁוַּע) is even more unpoetical than that of חבלי would be. On the other hand, וַיִּשְׁמַע may have been originally the expression used, and not יִשְׁמַע; without ו it is an expression (to be understood retrospectively) of the simultaneousness of the cry and the hearing; with ו it expresses the principal fact. The concluding line, וְשַׁוְעָתִי בְאָזְנָיו, is mangled: the short noun-clause is not meaningless (cf. Job xv. 21, Isa. v. 9); but it is only a fragment of the more copious and sonorous conclusion of the strophe in the psalter.

Vers. 8–10. Here the *Kerî* obliterates the significant alternation of the *Kal* and *Hithpa.* of גָּעַשׁ. Instead of וַתִּמּוֹסַדֵי, we have the feminine plural form מוֹסְדוֹת (as in both texts in *v.* 16) without ו; instead of the genitive הארץ, and with an exaggeration of the figure, השמים (cf. the pillars, Job xxvi. 11), which is not meant to be understood of the mountains as being Atlases supporting the heavens as it were, but of the points of support and centres of gravity of the heavens themselves: the whole universe trembles.

Vers. 11–13. Instead of the pictorial וַיֵּרָא (Deut. xxviii. 49, and from thence in Jeremiah), which is generally used of the flight of the eagle, we have the colourless וַיֵּרָא, "He appeared"; instead of יָשֶׁת, to be understood as an aorist, we have וַיָּשֶׁת, which is more regular, but less poetical here, where so many aorists with ו come together. In 12*a* the rise and fall of the parallel members are blended together into one unwieldy line: "and made darkness round about Him a pavilion" (סְכוֹת). The ἅπ. λεγ. חֲשֵׁרַת, however, is perhaps original; the derivative חֻשָּׁרִים (the nave of a wheel, as being a collection of spokes) guarantees to this word the significa-

tion, to collect; حشر is the word used frequently in the Koran of assembling to judgment; the Homeric *νεφεληγερέτα* may also be compared for our passage.[1] *V.* 13 is wretchedly mangled. Of עביו עברו ברד ו of the text in the psalter only the four letters בָּעֲרוּ (as in 9 *c*) are left.

Vers. 14–16. Instead of וַיַּרְעֵם we have יַרְעֵם, which is less suitable here, where a principal fact is stated, and the description draws nearer and nearer its goal. Instead of מִן־שָׁמַיִם (without assimilation, as in Judg. v. 20; cf. *infra*, xxx. 4) the other text has בַּשָּׁמַיִם. The circumstance, however, that the line בָּרָד וְגַחֲלֵי־אֵשׁ is wanting, is a welcome proof that in the psalter it is inadvertently repeated from the preceding strophe. On the other hand, חִצִּים is inferior to וּבְרָקִים רָב, חִצָּיו is corrupted into a tame בָּרָק, and the *Kerî*, וַיָּהֹם, mistakenly presupposes that the suffix of וַיְפִיצֵם refers to the arrows, *i.e.* lightnings. On the other hand, אפיקי יָם, channels *of the sea*, is perhaps original; מים might easily have been substituted for ים, as being the word commonly combined with אפיקי (xlii. 2, Joel i. 20). It is possible, however, that the case is exactly the same with ים here as with השמים in 8 *a*. יִגְלוּ instead of וַיִּגָּלוּ has the same meaning. The close of the strophe is weakened here also by the obliteration of the address to God: "by (בְּ instead of the מִ of the other text) the threatening of Jahve, at the snorting of the breath of His anger." In this wave-like beat of the members of the verse the change of prepositions is discomposing rather than agreeable.

[1] In Assyrian *ašâru* = חשר is a word that occurs frequently for collecting, bringing together, amassing; *e.g.* Sanh. v. 30: "he brought together (*ešura*) the war-chariots and baggage wagons"; Khors. 124: *uštešêra ṣindê'a akṣura ušmâni* (cf. חַשְׁמוֹנָה, resting place) "I gathered together my teams, contracted my camp" (Friedr. Delitzsch). On the other hand the Midrasch and the Talmud explain it after the Aramaic: "a straining of the clouds," seeing the clouds, like a sieve, let drops, that fall down close after one another and are still not connected, trickle down upon the earth (*Taanith*, 9 *b*, מחשרות מים על־גבי קרקע).

Vers. 17–20. The variant מִשְּׂנְאִי instead of וּמִשֹּׂנְאַי is of no importance, but מִשְּׁעָן instead of לְמִשְׁעָן, "for a support," is less acceptable both grammatically and rhythmically. The resolution of וַיֹּצִיאֵנִי into אֹתִי . . . וַיֵּצֵא lays stress upon the *me* in an unnecessary and clumsy manner.

Vers. 21–24. Instead of כְּצִדְקִי here and in *v.* 25, we find כְּצִדְקָתִי contrary to the usage of language in the Psalms (cf. vii. 9 with 1 Kings viii. 32). Instead of the poetical אָסִיר מֶנִּי (Job xxvii. 5, xxiii. 12) we have אָסוּר מִמֶּנָּה (with a neuter feminine), after the common phrase in 2 Kings iii. 3 and many other passages (cf. Deut. v. 32). Instead of וָאֱהִי, the no less common (*e.g.* cii. 8) וָאֱהְיֶה, and instead of וָאֶשְׁתַּמֵּר, the form with *ah* of direction, a form that in later Hebrew occurs very frequently in the 1st pers. of the historical mood, although it occurs also in earlier Hebrew (iii. 6, vii. 5, Gen. xxxii. 6, Num. viii. 19, Job xix. 20). Instead of עִמּוֹ we find לוֹ, which commends itself neither grammatically nor rhythmically, and is shown by *vv.* 26 and 27 to be certainly not original.

Vers. 25–28. On כְּבָרִי כְּצִדְקָתוֹ *vid. v.* 21. כְּבָרִי is unexampled, since elsewhere only בַּר יָדַיִם (כַּפַּיִם) denotes innocence. In גִּבּוֹר תָּמִים, *the upright man of valour*, which is equally extraordinary, גבור is used in exactly the same way as in גִּבּוֹר חַיִל (cf. the still more extraordinary גִּבּוֹר רֶשַׁע of the LXX. in Prov. xxviii. 3). The form תִּתָּבָר, which has only the sound of an assimilated *Hithpael* like תִּתַּמָּם (= תתתמם) and is rather a reflexive of the *Hiph.* הִבֵּר after the manner of the Aramaic *Ittaphal* (and therefore = תִּתְבָּרַר), and the form תִּתַּפָּל, which sounds like a *Hithpael* from תָּפַל (Thou showest Thyself insipid, absurd, foolish), but which, seeing that to ascribe תִּפְלָה to God (Job i. 22) is unbecoming even in expression, seems likewise to be conceived of as an *Ittaphal* with inverted assimilation = תִּתְהַפָּתֵל (Böttcher), are abbreviations, such as the language of everyday life allows itself, sometimes contrary to all rules (cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 348). וְאֶת instead

of כִּי at the beginning of *v.* 28 turns the substantion of the preceding statement into a continuation of it. The change of ועינים רמות into וְעֵינֶיךָ עַל־רָמִים is one of the most ingenious variants. The rendering: "and Thine eyes (are turned) down upon the haughty, that Thou mayest humble (them)" (Stier, Hengst. and others), is contrary to the accentuation and (taking תַּשְׁפִּיל as לְהַשְׁפִּילָם) grammatically harsh. Hitzig renders it, according to the accents: "and Thine eyes Thou lowerest against the proud," השפיל עינים = הפיל פנים in Jer. iii. 12. But if this were the meaning we should expect בְּ instead of עַל. It is better to render it after the analogy of Ps. cxiii. 6: "and Thine eyes Thou lowerest down upon the haughty"; according to which rendering the haughty are represented as being far beneath notwithstanding their pride; the lowering of the eyes is an expression of the utmost *despectus*.

Vers. 29–31. Here in *v.* 29*a* תָּאִיר has dropped out, for Jahve is called, and indeed is, אוֹר (xxvii. 1), but not גַּר; the form גִּיר follows the analogy of חֵיק, חִיל, and the like. The repetition יהוה ויהוה, by means of which the loss of תאיר and of אֱלֹהַי in *v.* 29*b* is made up, is inelegant. בָּךְ instead of בְּךָ, as in other two places in the Old Testament. The form אָרוּץ, as Isa. xlii. 4 shows, does not absolutely require to be derived from רוּץ; still רוּץ may equally well with דְּלֶג be joined with the accusative in the sense of running against, investing; therefore, seeing the parallelism is favourable to this meaning: by Thee I run upon a troop. The ו before בֵּאלֹהַי is omitted, certainly not to the advantage of the rhythm.

Vers. 32–35. In *v.* 32 the great variety of expression presented in the other text is lost. Instead of הַמְאַזְּרֵנִי חָיִל we find, as if from a faded MS., מָעוּזִּי חַיִל (according to Norzi מָעוּזִּי), my refuge (literally, shelter) of strength, *i.e.* my strong refuge, according to a syntactically finer mode of expression (מעוזי מָעוֹז חיל =), as in lxxi. 7, Lev. vi. 3, xxvi. 42; *vid.*

Nägelsbach, § 63 *g*, where it is correctly proved that in certain cases this form of expression is a matter of necessity.[1] The form מָעוּזִי appears here to recognise a מָעוֹז, hiding-place, refuge, = معاذ, different from מָעֹז, stronghold (from עָזַז); but just as everywhere else the punctuation confuses the two substantives (*vid.* on xxxi. 3), so here also, since מָעוֹז from עזז ought to have been inflected, not מָעוּזִי, but מְעוּזִי, like מְנוּסִי; still we may look upon the *scriptio plena* as an indication that מעוז is meant here to be a synonym of מַחֲסֶה. Instead of וַיִּתֵּן (תמים דרכי) we have here וַיִּתֵּר, perhaps: He caused my way to be flawless, *i.e.* made it so. So Ewald, referring to the modern Arabic خلّى, to cause = to make, effect, bring about; even the ancient classical Arabic language used ترك (to cause) as well as ودع (*deponere*) in the sense of جعل (to make); *e.g.* "I have made (تَرَكْتُ) the sword my bed-fellow" *i.e.* my inseparable attendant (literally, I have caused it be such), as it is to be translated in Nöldeke's *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poesie der alten Araber*, p. 131.[2] Or does הִתִּיר

[1] In the case before us, כְּעוֹז חֵילִי, like מַחֲסֵה עֻזִּי in lxxi. 7 (cf. Ezek. xvi. 27, xviii. 7 and perhaps Hab. iii. 8), would not be inappropriate; although in the other mode of expression the idea of its being divinely provided and granted comes out more clearly. In cases however like בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב my covenant with Jacob (Lev. xxvi. 42), מִדּוֹ בַד, his garment of linen (Lev. vi. 3), כְּתָבָם תַּמְתִּיחֲשִׁים, their ancestral register (Ezra ii. 62), it would be altogether inadmissible to join the suffix to the *nomen rectum;* and it is probable that this transposing of the pronominal suffix to the *nomen regens* originated in such cases, where it was a matter of logical necessity, and thence passed over into the *syntaxis ornata;* however, *vid.* Philippi, *Ueber den Status Constructus*, p. 14, who, looking at the syntax of the other Semitic dialects, holds חַיִל in our passage and other similar expressions (lxxi. 7, Ezek. xvi. 27) to be an accusative of definition. So also Driver, *Tenses*, § 193. On a similar phenomenon in the connecting together of substantives and adjectives, *vid.* Ges., § 110, 2 *b*.

[2] Line 13 in page 133 of the same work is to be translated with Fleischer: ye have made (تركتم) my milch camels become restless, *i.e.*

assert its full literal signification "to unfetter"? This is more probable, seeing that the Hebrew *usus loquendi* does not show any indication of הִתִּיר being as yet employed in the post-biblical signification "to allow, permit," a signification which must have formed the transition to "to cause to be = to effect, bring about." We must, therefore, rather compare Koran ix. 15: *challû sebîlahum*, "loose their way," *i.e.* let them go free, and explain it: He unfettered, enlarged, left to itself, "He caused my walk to go on as flawless (inoffensive)." Hitzig, following the *Chethîb*, דרכו, renders it differently: "and caused the upright to leap along his way." But when תמים is found along with דרכו the presumption is that it is to be looked on as its predicate, and, moreover, הִתִּיר means "to cause to jump up" (Hab. iii. 6), not, "to jump or skip along." Still, the *Chethîb*, דרכו, which receives from the following *Chethîb*, רגליו, the appearance of having been intended, certainly seems to understand תמים personally: He unfettered the upright in his way, making his feet like, etc. The reading וְנַחַת, instead of וְנִחָתָה, although syntactically admissible (Ges., § 147 *a*), spoils the euphony of the rhythm.

Vers. 36, 37. The pentastich is mangled here by the dropping out of the middle line in *v.* 36: and Thy right hand supported me. Instead of the significant וְעַנְוָתְךָ (and Thy condescension) we have here יְעֻנָּתְךָ, which, according to the usage of the language, does not mean "Thy lowliness" (Hengst.). It might rather mean "Thy pains or trouble" (Böttch.), but on no account "answering Thee," *i.e.* obeying Thee (LXX., Symm.). What it really means is: "Thy responding," answering, *i.e.* the actual assistance, with which Thou didst answer my requests. Instead of תַּחְתֵּנִי, we find here (and also in *vv.* 40 and 48) תַּחְתֵּנִי, probably an inaccuracy of the common dialect, which the written language also occasionally

have caused them to be such, by stealing them and driving them away, so that they now yearn after their home and their young.

allows itself (*e.g.* cxxxix. 11) for the sake of euphony (Ges., § 103, remark 3).[1]

Vers. 38–41. As is frequently the case, the cohortative (אֶרְדְּפָה) has the sense of a hypothetical protasis; it is sometimes used thus with reference to the present, as in cxxxix. 8, sometimes with reference to the past, as in lxxiii. 16 and here: in case I pursued. In the text in the psalter we find וַאַשְׁמִידֵם, here וַאֲאַפֵּסֵם, whereby the echo of Ex. xv. is obliterated. And after עַד־כְּלוֹתָם how tautological is the וַאֲכַלֵּם, which was meant to make up for the shortening of the verse! The verse, viz., is shortened at the end, by the transforming of וְלֹא־יְכֹלוּ קוּם into וְלֹא יָקוּמוּן. וַיִּפְּלוּ, instead of יִפְּלוּ, is not inappropriate. Instead of וַתְּאַזְּרֵנִי, we find וַתַּזְרֵנִי, with a syncope belonging to the language of the people; cf. תְּזֻלִי for תְּאָזְלִי in Jer. ii. 36, מְלֹךְ for מְאֹלָךְ in Job xxxv. 11. נָתְתָּה = תַּתָּה is an aphæresis of the same kind taken from the mouth of the people, and not an error in writing (so also König., *Lehrgeb.*, p. 300 *f.*). The conjunctive ו of ומשׂנאי stands here as apodotic in connection with אצמיתם: my haters, them I destroy. In this respect the other text is all through simpler and more elegant.

Vers. 42, 43. Instead of יְשַׁוְּעוּ, we have the tolerable *quid-proquo* יִשְׁעוּ (from שָׁעָה, not, as Luther derives it, from שׁעע, *mulcere, adulari*): they look out for help, or even: they look full of expectation towards their gods (Isa. xvii. 8, xxxi. 1). The two figures of speech in *v.* 43, however, appear distorted here as compared with the other text: and I pulverised them as the dust of the ground, as mire of the streets I crushed them, I pounded them. The soaring figure כעפר על־פני־רוח is weakened into כעפר־ארץ. Instead of אֲרִיקֵם we have the glossarial and overloaded אֲדַקֵּם אֲרַקְעֵם. The former of these (√דק, דך, to break in pieces) is instead of the אריקם of the

[1] In Phœnician, *Sid.* i. 9, תחתנם, "in their place," occurs; Schröder regards the נ as the nunation of the accusatival *taḥtan*, = تَحْتًا.

other text in the misunderstood sense of אַרְקֵם; the latter (√רק, to stretch, to make broad, thin and compact) looks like a gloss of this ארקם. Seeing that people do not intentionally either crush or pound the mire of the street, nor tread it out thin or broad, we must here take not only כעפר־ארץ, but also כטיט־חוצות as referring to the result (so that they become like it).[1]

Vers. 44–46. The variant רִיבֵי עַמִּי proceeds upon the correct assumption, that ריבי refers to the hostility shown to David by foes belonging to his native country; the supposition that עַמִּי is a *plur. apoc.* = עַמִּים, as it is apparently in cxliv. 2, and like מְנִי = מְנִים in xlv. 9, has no ground here. The judicious variant, תִּשְׁמְרֵנִי, agrees with עַמִּי: Thou didst keep me (didst reserve me) to be the head of nations, viz. inasmuch as He did not allow David to be deprived of the throne by foes among his own people. The two lines of *v.* 45 are transposed, and not to their disadvantage. The *Hithpa.* יִתְכַּחֲשׁוּ instead of the *Piel.* יְכַחֲשׁוּ (cf. lxvi. 3, lxxxi. 16) is the reflexive of the latter: they made themselves flatterers; cf. the *Niph.* in Deut. xxxiii. 29: to show one's self flattering, like the יִשָּׁמְעוּ which follows here, *audientes se præstabant* = *obediebant*. Instead of (אָזֶן) לִשְׁמַע, we have here, in the same signification, but less elegantly, (אֹזֶן) לִשְׁמוּעַ: on the hearing of the ear, *i.e.* hearsay. Instead of וַיַּחְרְגוּ we find וַיַּחְגְּרוּ, either with a solecistical transposition of the consonants (cf. פָּרִין, 2 Sam. xiii. 27, for פָּצַר), or in a peculiar signification. "They girt" (*accincti prodeunt*) does not yield any meaning that is suited to this picture of voluntary submission. But חָגַר (whence the Talmudic חִגֵּר, lame) may have signified "to halt, limp" in the language of the people, which may be understood of those who drag themselves along with difficulty and reluctance (Hitz.), "out of their

[1] Zech. x. 5 must be explained differently: treading down in the mire of the streets (viz. everything that opposes in a hostile manner).

close places (holds)," here with the suffix *ām* instead of *ĕhém*.

Vers. 47–49. The צוּר which has found its way into 47*b* is burdensome; וְיָרֹם (without any need of correcting it into וְיָרֹם) is optative; cf. Gen. xxvii. 31, Prov. ix. 4, 16. Instead of וַיַּדְבֵּר, we have the less significant and syntactically less elegant וּמֹרִיד: and subdueth. Here also we consistently find תַּחְתֵּנִי instead of תַּחְתָּי. Instead of מְפַלְטִי, we find וּמוֹצִיאִי, an expression which is peculiar and of which there is no other occurrence (for *v.* 20 is different): "and who bringeth me forth from mine enemies" who surround me. Instead of the poetical אַף we have the prose גַּם, instead of מִן־קָמַי, מִקָּמַי, and instead of חָמָס (אִישׁ), חֲמָסִים (אִישׁ), a plural (cxl. 2, 5, Prov. iv. 17) which is foreign to the genuine Davidic Psalms.

Vers. 50, 51. The transposition of the יהוה in *v.* 50 *a* and the substitution of אֲזַמֵּר for אֲזַמְּרָה are against the rhythm; the former is also contrary to the usual custom (cf. lvii. 10, cviii. 4). Whereas מגדל of the other text is vocalised, not מִגְדַּל, but מַגְדִּיל, in this text מגדיל is corrected into מְגַדּוֹל: tower of fulness of salvation—a figure which reminds one of lxi. 4, Prov. xviii. 10, but which is vague and bizarre in this connection; moreover it is only as a proper name that *migdol* is used in the Old Testament instead of *migdal*, tower. Still this expression has become, in this form, an integral portion of the Pesach-Haggada.

If now we once more glance at the mutual relationship of the two texts, we cannot speak of finding the original readings in anything like equal proportions in them both. With the exception of the correct omission of 14*c* and the readings מִשְׁבְּרֵי, חִשֶּׂרֶת and אֲפִיקֵי יָם, almost nothing in the text of 2 Sam. xxii. has decisively commended itself to us. That it is a careful, and even a Davidic, recension of the other (Hengst.), is an assertion without ground and probability; for what we find in 2 Sam. xxii. is a varying text, not a recasting of its contents into a new form. The text of 2 Sam. xxii. rests, as

we have shown, upon careless written and oral tradition. The somewhat decided tendency to *scriptio defectiva* suggests a great antiquity for the copy from which it was taken. We can easily understand that in historical works the poetical insertions were less carefully dealt with. It is characteristic of the form of the text of the Psalm in 2 Sam. xxii. that in not a few places licences of expression common in the language of the people have found their way into it. Böttcher is by no means wholly mistaken in calling the text in the psalter the recension of the priests and that in Second Samuel the recension of the laity.

PSALM XIX.

PRAYER TO GOD, THE GOD WHO IS REVEALED IN A TWOFOLD MANNER.

2 The heavens recount the glory of God,
And the firmament maketh known His hands' work,
3 Day unto day welleth forth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge—
4 There is no speech and there are no words,
Whose voice is inaudible.

5 Their line goeth forth into all lands,
And their utterances unto the end of the world;
For the sun hath He set a tent therein,
6 And he like a bridegroom goeth forth from his chamber,
Rejoiceth like a hero to run his course.
7 From one end of the heavens is his going forth,
And his circuit unto the ends thereof,
And nothing can withdraw itself from his heat.

8 The law of Jahve is flawless, refreshing the soul;
The testimony of Jahve is faithful, making wise the simple;
9 The precepts of Jahve are right, rejoicing the heart;
The commandment of Jahve is pure, enlightening the eyes;
10 The fear of Jahve is clean, enduring for ever;
The decisions of Jahve are truth, righteous altogether.

11 More to be desired are they than gold, yea, much fine gold,
And sweeter than honey and the honey-comb.

12 Thy servant is also warned by them; in keeping them is great reward.
13 Lapses—who marketh them? From hidden (faults) clear thou me.
14 Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins,
so that they do not have dominion over me!
Then shall I be guiltless and clear from great transgression.
15 Accepted be the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart
In Thy sight, Jahve, my rock and my redeemer!!

In the title of Ps. xviii. David is called עבד ה׳, and in Ps. xix. he so names himself. In both Psalms, there at the beginning, here at the close, he calls upon Jahve with the name צורי. These and other coincidences (*Symb.*, p. 49) have induced the compiler to make Ps. xix., which celebrates God's revelation of Himself in nature and law, follow immediately after Ps. xviii., which celebrates God's revelation of Himself in David's history. The view that we have before us in Ps. xix. two torsi that have somehow or other been brought together, two fragments of song, the first of which is without a conclusion, and the latter without a commencement (Ew.), is a view which there is no reason to compel us to adopt. Hupfeld admits that the two halves, *vv.* 2–7 and 8–15, can easily be brought under one general abstract category, but "only for us, who are accustomed to reflection." In opposition to this assertion it has been remarked by Hitzig and also by Riehm, that the identity of Elohim and Jahve, *i.e.* of the Creator of the world and the God of redemption, is a fundamental thought of the believing consciousness of Israel, a thought that is expressed at the very beginning of the Thôra. And there was no need of any such externally marked transition from the sun to the Thôra

as Hupfeld desiderates; the transition lies in this, that the strain of praise that is raised to God as אֵל by His works is surpassed by the praise that accrues to Him as יהוה from the word of His revelation (xviii. 31; cf. *v.* 23)—thus the poet opens up the way to his petition for justification and sanctification by means of the praise that wells up as the result of wondering and loving adoration. This petition grows out of the praise of the mercy of the God who is revealed in His word, without reverting to the first part, *vv.* 2–7; for, as Lord Bacon says, while it is true that the heavens declare the glory of God, they do not declare His will, according to which the poet begs to be pardoned and sanctified. If we consider also that Ps. xix. was occasioned by the view of the heavens by day, just as Ps. viii. was occasioned by the view of the heavens by night, the unity of this praise that is rendered to God by both these revelations of Him becomes still clearer. It is morning, and the singer rejoices on the one hand in the dawning light of day, and on the other, with a view to the day's work which lies before him, places himself in the light of the Thôra. Each half of the Psalm consists of 14 lines, and each is also naturally divided into a six- and an eight-line strophe. In the second half, however, the place of the short lines is taken by the scheme of the cæsura, which as it were rises higher, draws deeper breaths, rises and falls like the waves of the sea; for the Thôra inspires the poet more than does the sun. And this also is significant: in the first part God is called אֵל in accordance with His relation to the world as a Being possessed of power, and is named only once; in the second part, on the other hand, He receives His covenant name יהוה, and is named seven times, the last time with a threefold full-toned name, which forms also the conclusion of the Psalm, יהוה צורי וגאלי.

The last strophe gives a sharply outlined soteriology *in nuce*. If we take Ps. xxxii. along with it, we have the whole of the way of salvation in almost Pauline clearness and defi-

niteness. Paul also quotes both these Psalms; they were certainly his favourites.

Vers. 2–4. How glorious God and, indeed, אֵל is, as the absolutely Mighty One, and what His hands have made, *i.e.* what He has brought forth by His superior power, to which everything is possible, is declared by the heavens (*i.e.* the supermundane spheres which are lost to human sight in infinite space), and stated plainly by the firmament, *i.e.* the transparent vault of heaven which is stretched out far and wide above the earth (Gr. Venet. τάμα = ἔκταμα; from רָקִיעַ, √רק, to stretch, extend). The heavens and the firmament are not thought of as conscious beings, as the thinkers of the Middle Ages, depending on Aristotle (*vid.* Maimuni, *More Nebuchim*, 2, 5), believed they could prove from our passage; cf. Neh. ix. 6, Job xxxviii. 7. Nor does Scripture know anything of a music of the spheres after the manner of the Pythagoreans. What is meant is, as the old expositors correctly say, *objectivum vocis non articulatæ præconium*. The doxa, which God has lent to creation as a reflection of His own, is reflected back by it and as it were given back to God in the form of a confession of Him. The thought of the continuousness of this proclamation of theirs, which is already implied in the participle, is unfolded in *v.* 3. The word of this proclamation of praise is transmitted in an unbroken chain of tradition. הַבִּיעַ, (from נָבַע, נִבַּע, √נב, to well forth, in addition to which, however, there is also √בע, to gush) points to the rich fulness in which, as from an inexhaustible spring, the testimony passes on from one day to the next; the parallel חִוָּה is a non-figurative, but poetical and more Aramaic (= הַחֲוִי) than Hebrew, word. אֹמֶר also belongs to the loftier style; the γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is implanted in creation, although not reflected, is here called דַּעַת. The poet does not say that, when the proclamation made by the day is about to cease as the day declines, it is taken up by the night, and the proclamation of the latter by the day; but (seeing the proclama-

tion made by the day has for its purport the works of God that are visible by day, and that made by the night His works that are visible at night) that each day as it dawns continues the discourse of that which has passed away, and each night as it falls continues the proclamation made by that which has vanished. If now *v.* 4 were to be rendered: there is no speech, and there are no words, their voice is inaudible, *i.e.* they are mute, noiseless, speechless witnesses, yet witnesses that speak loudly (Hengst., Hupf.), their language is only inwardly audible, yet it is intelligible everywhere (Then.), then *v.* 5 ought at least to have begun with a ו adversative, and even then the poet would be weakening his poetic strain in a needless, tame and violent manner. To take *v.* 4 with Ewald as a prefixed circumstantial clause to *v.* 5: "without loud speech . . . their sound has resounded through the whole earth" (§ 341 *d*) is impossible; there is nothing in *v.* 4 to indicate that it is meant to be subordinated to *v.* 5. If, however, we take it as an independent sentence in the sense: "there is no loud, no articulate speech, no audible voice, which proceeds from the heavens," then *v.* 5 would form an antithesis to it; but there is nothing to indicate that such is the case, whereas, if it were so, at least וְצָא should have been placed first. Luther's rendering is better: "there is no language nor speech, where one does not hear their voice," *i.e.* as Calvin also explains it: the testimony of the heavens to God is understood by the peoples of all languages and tongues. But this must have been אֵין לָשׁוֹן or אֵין שָׂפָה (Gen. xi. 1). Hofmann's rendering is similar but more admissible: "there is no speech and there are no words, that their cry is not heard, *i.e.* the speaking of the heavens goes on alongside of all other speaking; however much men may discourse, one still hears therewith the speech or the sound of the heavens, their sound is heard above all else." But נִשְׁמַע (בלי) must in that case have been pointed as a finite verb (cf. Gen. xxxi. 20), and בְּלִי יִשָּׁמַע (as in Job xli.

18, Hos. viii. 8) would have been the best way of expressing it. בְּלִי with the participle is a poetical expression of *Alpha privat.* (2 Sam. i. 21); accordingly בלי נִשְׁמָע is "unheard" or "inaudible," the antithesis of נִשְׁמָע, "audible," in Jer. xxxi. 15. We are therefore shut up to the translation of the LXX., Aq., Symm., Theod., Syr., Targ., Vulg., Vitr., and Hitz.: there is no speech and no words, whose voice would be unheard, *i.e.* inaudible. There is no reason for asserting that this interpretation destroys the parallelism (Hupf.); the structure of the distich is the same as in cxxxix. 4. The proclamation made by the heavens and the firmament, by the day (the sky by day) and the night (the sky by night), is no confused din (Targ.), it is no proclamation made in a corner; it is a proclamation in speech that is everywhere audible, in words that are everywhere understood, a *φανερόν* (Rom. i. 19).

Vers. 5–7. Seeing that אֹמֶר and דְּבָרִים are the speech and words of the heavens, the principal term that dominates all the rest and comprehends in itself both יוֹם and לילה, the suffixes of קַוָּם and מִלֵּיהֶם may undoubtedly be referred to הַשָּׁמַיִם, notwithstanding the fact that to the קוֹלָם of *v.* 4 there must be given another reference. Jer. xxxi. 39 shows how קָו, or, with tonelong *ā*, קָו, is to be understood when used along with יָצָא. The measuring-line of the heavens has gone forth into all the earth, *i.e.* has taken entire possession of it. Verse 5 *b* states what kind of a measuring line is meant, viz. that of their heraldship: their words (from the more Aramaic than Hebrew, and, therefore, poetical מִלָּה) reach to the end of the world, they fill it entirely from its utmost limit to its centre. The קָו of Isaiah (xxviii. 10) is inapplicable here, if for no other reason than this, that it does not mean commandment, but norm, and is there a word of derision rhyming with צָו. More might be said in justification of the translation, "their sound" (LXX., Symm., Jerome), seeing that קו might denote a harpstring as being a cord in tension

and then, like τόνος (Sanscrit *tânas*, threads, tone), tone or sound (Gesen. in his Lexicon and Ewald). Adopting this view Hoelemann interprets it: the whole earth is a stringed Æolian harp. But the usage of the language assigns to קָו, when used along with יצא, the meaning, measuring-line (Aq. κανών; cf. 2 Cor. x. 13); and this gives a new thought, whereas in the other case that which was already expressed in *v.* 4 would merely be repeated. In Rom. x. 18 Paul makes use of these two first lines of the strophe, in order to testify to the fact that the preaching of the apostles has gone forth over the whole world. Accordingly the older expositors for the most part take the first half of the Psalm as an allegorical prophecy, the heavens as a figure of the Church, and the sun as a figure of the Gospel. Chr. A. Crusius has already shown how inadmissible and unnecessary this is. In the passage referred to the apostle does not quote in a formal manner; he only gives a New Testament turn to Old Testament words, taking the all-penetrating *præconium cœlorum* as a figure of the all-penetrating *præconium evangelii;* and he was justified in doing so by the parallel which the psalmist himself draws between the revelation in nature and in Scripture.

From *v.* 2 onwards the principal subject is הַשָּׁמַיִם, with which the Psalm commences. Just as קָוָּם and מְלֵיהֶם refer to the heavens, so also does בָּהֶם. There, in the heavens, God has assigned to the sun its residence (on אֹהֶל *vid.* on Isa. xl. 22), whence it goes forth when it rises, and to which it returns when it goes down. The collocation of the words is opposed to our reading שָׁם (Ew.: there, at the end of the world) instead of שָׂם; and perhaps Hitz. is right in saying that the poet's reason for writing בהם and not שָׂם at the end of the verse was because he had already used this שָׂם. Nor is there anything compelling us to take בָּהֶם, as in Isa. xxx. 6, in a neuter signification: "there" (our own former interpretation). In Arabic the name of the sun, שֶׁמֶשׁ, is always

feminine; in Hebrew, on the other hand, and in Aramaic, it is predominantly masculine (cf. on the other hand Gen. xv. 17, Cant. i. 6, Nah. iii. 17, Isa. xlv. 6, Mal. iii. 20), just as also the Babylonians and Assyrians, the Sabeans and heathen Arabs, had a masculine sun-god.[1] Accordingly Helios is compared in *v.* 6 to a bridegroom, who goes forth in the morning from his חֻפָּה. Joel ii. 16 shows that this word does not mean, as in later Hebrew, the bridal canopy, but the bride-chamber. There is a freshness in the morning light; it rays forth joy; it is like the renewal of one's youth; *Sonne* (sun) rhymes with *Wonne* (delight). Therefore the morning sun is like a bridegroom, who, having attained the object of his longing, feels himself as it were at the beginning of a new life, and whose youthful countenance beams with delight and the bliss of love. And as in its rising it is like a bridegroom, so in its rapid course (Sir. xliii. 5) it is like a hero (*vid.* on xviii. 34), inasmuch as, so often as it comes forth, it ever anew traverses its orbit in joyous movement (שׂוּשׂ, שָׂשׂ; مشاش, *med. o*, to run hither and thither, to be in a state of violent commotion; *vid. D.M.Z.*, xxii. 140) and with גְּבוּרָה (Judg. v. 31), light-giving and overcoming all hindrances. Its going forth (= rising; cf. Hos. vi. 3; the antithesis is מָבוֹא, going in = setting) is from one end (מִקְצֵה, always without *dag.*) of the heavens, the extreme east of the horizon, and its circuit, תְּקוּפָה (from קוּף = נָקַף, Isa. xxix. 1, to revolve), עַל־קְצוֹתָם, to their, the heavens', end (= עַד, Deut. iv. 32); cf. 1 Esdr. iv. 34: ταχὺς τῷ δρόμῳ ὁ ἥλιος, ὅτι στρέφεται

[1] The Gothic *sunnô* (*sunna*), the old High German and old Saxon *sunno*, and the middle High German *sunne* are likewise masculine. On the other hand the Anglo-Saxon *sunne* is fem.; the gender of the old English *sonne* varies; Shakspeare, however, uses *sun* (like the French *soleil*) for the most part as a masculine; *e.g. Venus and Adonis* 856: "The sun ariseth in his majesty," and 859: "Venus salutes him with this fair good-morrow." The personification of the sun as Apollo, Phœbus, Titan has contributed to its being represented as masc.

ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀποτρέχει εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ. Upon this long way there is nothing נִסְתָּר, hidden, *i.e.* remaining hidden, from its heat; חַמָּה (that which is hot = heat) is here the illuminating and warming influence of the sun; elsewhere it is a poetical name of the sun itself (as that which is hot).

Vers. 8–11. The transition from the one part of the Psalm to the other is not marked by anything external; it is indicated, however, by the circumstance that the divine name יהוה now takes the place of אֵל. Just as the sun is אוֹר, so is also the Thôra (Prov. vi. 23). And whereas the word of nature reveals God as אֵל, the word of Scripture reveals Him as יהוה; the former proclaims God's power and glory, the latter also His counsel and will. There follow twelve encomiums of the law, each two of which are always related to one another as antecedent and consequent, rising and falling after the manner of waves in accordance with the scheme of the cæsura. One feels how the heart of the poet, now that he comes to speak of God's word, the revelation of His will, begins to beat in a doubly joyous manner. By itself תּוֹרָה does not mean the law, but direction, instruction, teaching, more especially divine instruction or teaching and therefore that which is positive; it is accordingly used also of prophecy (Isa. i. 10, viii. 16), and predictively of the New Testament gospel (Isa. ii. 3); here, however, no other divine revelation is meant than that which was given through Moses, and which has become the law, *i.e.* the rule of life (*νόμος*), of Israel; and this law is meant not merely in its preceptive and disciplinary, but also in its promissory, character. The encomiums, which the poet pronounces upon the law, are warranted also from a New Testament point of view. Even Paul says in Rom. vii. 12, 14: "the law is holy and spiritual; the commandment is holy and righteous and good." The law deserves these encomiums in itself; and for him, who stands in the state of grace, it is indeed no longer a law pronouncing

a curse, but a mirror of the God who is gracious in holiness a mirror into which he can look without slavish fear, and a norm of hearty and willing obedience. And how totally different is the love of the psalmists and prophets for the law, a love that had regard to that which was essential and of universal ethical significance in the commandments, which aimed at spiritualising the letter and at enjoying the consolation that was involved in the promises, from the pharisaical and rabbinical worship of the letter and of ceremonies that was characteristic of the post-exilic period!

The divine law, as being absolutely of a friendly purport, and aiming entirely at the weal of man, is called תְּמִימָה, "perfect," *i.e.* flawless and harmless. It is also called מְשִׁיבַת נָפֶשׁ, restoring, bringing back, *i.e.* revivifying, quickening the soul (cf. *Pil.* שׁוֹבֵב xxiii. 3), for him viz. who obeys the gracious will of God that is expresed therein, and who walks in the way of salvation appointed by Him. In the second half of *v.* 8 the place of תורה is taken by עֵדוּת (just as the tables of the ten commandments are called לֻחוֹת הָעֵדוּת), from עוד (הֵעִיד), which signifies an attestation which is not merely corroborative, but also admonitory and preceptive. The testimony of Jahve is נֶאֱמָנָה, to be relied on, trustworthy, sure, *i.e.* raised above all doubt as to the meaning of its declarations, and verifying itself in its threatenings and promises, and for that very reason it is מַחְכִּימַת פֶּתִי, making wise simplicity or the simple, literally openness, him that is open (a word that is in itself ethically indifferent, and which is used in Hebrew to describe the man who is open to temptation, in Arabic, the man who is open to everything that is noble)—to this man, the one who is easily tempted and led astray, it gives a solid basis and stay, *σοφίζει αὐτόν* (2 Tim. iii. 15). The law falls into פִּקּוּדִים, precepts or declarations regarding the duty of man; these are יְשָׁרִים, upright, both when viewed as a *norma normata*, seeing they proceed from the upright, absolutely good will of God, and as a *norma normans*, seeing

they lead along a straight way in the right track; they are therefore מְיַשְּׂמְחֵי לֵב, the education and guidance they afford deliver one from all vacillation, satisfy all moral needs, and impart the joyous consciousness that one is on a right way towards the right goal. מִצְוַת ה׳, Jahve's statute (from צָוָה, *statuere*), is the sum and substance of His commandments. It is בָּרָה, pure, like the light of the sun (Cant. vi. 10), and its light it imparts to others: מְאִירַת עֵינַיִם, enlightening eyes, which is meant not only in the sense of enlightening the understanding, but also one's whole condition; it makes one clear intellectually, healthy and fresh both bodily and mentally, for dimness of the eyes is sorrow, melancholy and restlessness. In this chain of names for the law, יראת ה׳ is not the fear of God as a prestation, but as a precept, the fear of God as God's revelation demands, effects and maintains it; it is, therefore, the revealed way and method in which one has to fear God (xxxiv. 12); in short, it is the religion of Jahve (cf. Prov. xv. 33, with Deut. xvii. 19). This is טְהוֹרָה, clean, like the word, which resembles pure gold, by which it is taught (xii. 7; cf. Job xxviii. 19); and for this reason it עוֹמֶדֶת לָעַד, enduring for ever, in opposition to all false ways of reverencing God, which imply their self-condemnation in themselves. The מִשְׁפְּטֵי ה׳ are the *jura* of the law considered as a *corpus juris divini*, everything which according to Jahve's decision is right and valid. These judgments are אֱמֶת, truth which endures and authenticates itself, because, in distinction from the most of the non-Israelitish laws, they have an unchangeable ethical foundation: צָדְקוּ יַחְדָּו, *i.e.* they are one and all צַדִּיקִים, in accordance with right and with facts (Deut. iv. 8, according to Kautzsch[1] an echo of the passage before us), because no charge of being inexpedient or of sanctioning injustice can be brought against them; in the law of Jahve the eternal will of God has found a relatively perfect

[1] *Derivata des St.* צדק (1881), p. 10.

expression of itself so far as it is meant to be a national law. With הַנֶּחֱמָדִים (instead of which Ben-Naftali, preferring the simple *Schebâ* along with gutturals, points הַנֶּחְמָדִים) the poet sums up the characteristics he has enumerated; the article is summative, like that in הַשִּׁשִּׁי at the close of the account of the six days' work of creation (Gen. i. 31). פָּז (פָּז) is the most refined, the finest gold (cf. 1 Kings x. 18 with 2 Chron. ix. 17); as فِضَّة, silver, shows, it very likely originally meant precious metal, separated from the ore that contained it, from פָּזַז = فَضَّ, to set free, to get rid, violently of what is hard (different from the cognate פָּתַת, فَتَّ, to take apart that which is divisible, to break into small pieces); the Targum renders it with אוֹבְרִיזִין, *ὄβρυζον*, *i.e.* gold which has stood the fire-test, *obrussa*, of the crucible or cupel. נֹפֶת צוּפִים "outpouring (from נפת = نَفَثَ) of the honeycombs" is the virgin honey, *i.e.* the honey that flows of itself from the cells; when a distinction is drawn between צוּף and יַעֲרָה (יַעַר), the former appears to denote the cell of a honeycomb, the latter the honeycomb itself, the former seems to be equivalent to *favus*, the latter to *cera*, *κηρίον*, *μελίκηρον*. God's revealed words are to be desired by him who has them still outside himself; they are sweet to him, to whom they have been imparted inwardly.

Vers. 12–15. The poet, who is conscious of being a servant of God, and who is bent upon bearing himself as becometh such an one, allows God's revealed words to serve the purpose for which they were given: he is נִזְהָר, one who suffers himself to be enlightened, made wiser and warned by them. After the analogy of the usual collocation of words (*e.g.* Hos. vi. 11) גַּם belongs to נִזְהָר, just as in *v.* 14 it belongs to חֲשֹׂךְ. He knows that בְּשָׁמְרָם (with a subjective suffix in an objective sense; cf. xxv. 7), in keeping of them, there lies, or is included, a great reward עֵקֶב, that which follows upon

one's heels (עָקֵב), which comes behind,[1] here said of the consequence of one's behaviour. Then, seeing that the law is not only a copy of the divine will, but also a mirror of self-knowledge, he prays for forgiveness in respect of the many sins of infirmity (the greater number of which, moreover, are unknown to him), to which even the pardoned one succumbs. שְׁגִיאָה (in the terminology of the law, שְׁגָגָה, ἀγνόημα) comprehends the whole province of the *peccatum involuntarium*, both the *peccatum ignorantiæ* and the *peccatum infirmitatis*. The question *delicta quis intelligit* is equivalent to the negative proposition: because of the unfathomable character of the human heart, and because of the so often specious disguise and great subtlety of sin, no one makes a complete survey of his faults. As an inference from this there follows the prayer: absolve me also מִנִּסְתָּרוֹת, *ab occultis* (*peccatis*, which, however, cannot be grammatically supplied), equivalent to מֵעֲלָמִים (xc. 8), *i.e.* from all such sins as even he, who strives with all earnestness after sanctification, does not discern, in consequence of the continual limitation of his knowledge of himself and of sin, although he would fain discern them. נָקָה is like δικαιοῦν a *vox judicialis*: to declare innocent, absolve, let go unpunished. The prayer for justification is followed in *v.* 14 by the prayer for sanctification, and indeed for preservation from presumptuous sins. From זוּד, זיד, to boil, to bubble, *Hiph.* to sin wantonly, deliberately, daringly, the opposite of sinning from weakness (Ex. xxi. 14, Deut. xviii. 22, xvii. 12), there are formed זֵד, the daring, insolent sinner (*e.g.* Mal. iii. 15), who sins, not בִּשְׁגָגָה, but בְּזָדוֹן (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 28, where David's brothers bring this charge against him), or בְּיָד רָמָה,

[1] The heel receives its name, עָקֵב, from the incurvation (√עק, עכ, עג, to bend, check, restrain, *accrocher*) and עָקֵב is what is behind one, what follows him; cf. the Arab. *ʿâḳibahu*, *ʿâkbahu*, immediately behind him; he has died عن غير عَقِبٍ without leaving any descendants behind him.

and also the neuter collective term זְדִים (cf. סְטִים, ci. 3, Hos. v. 2; יְשָׁרִים, Prov. xvi. 13; רֵיקִים, Prov. xii. 11; cf. viii. 6), *peccata proœretica* or *contra conscientiam*, sins which cast one out of the state of grace (Num. xv. 27–31), the latter being derived from זד in the neuter sense, that which boils over, like עד in the decalogue, that which bears witness, *i.e.* witness, testimony. זְדִים must here have the meaning we have given it, for if it had been intended of arrogant, insolent possessors of power (Ew., Hupf., Riehm), the petition would have been for something else than for "keeping back" (חָשַׂךְ as in 1 Sam. xxv. 39 in the mouth of David). The זְדִים, presumptuous sins, if they are repeated, become dominating sins, which irresistibly enslave man (מָשַׁל, with a non-personal subject, as in Isa. iii. 4 *b*; cf. Ps. ciii. 19); hence the last member of the climax (which advances from the *peccatum involuntarium* to the *proœreticum*, and from it to the *regnans*): may such sins not have dominion over me. The first half of the verse closes with אל־ימשלו בי, which has more appropriately *Olewejored* (Wickes) than *Dechî* (Baer). Then, אָז, when Thou vouchsafest to me this twofold grace, the grace of forgiveness and the grace of preservation, shall I be irreproachable (אִיתָּם 1 *impf. Kal* instead of אֵתָּם with ' as representative of *ē*) and absolved (וְנִקֵּיתִי, not *Piel* as in *v.* 13, but *Niph.*, to be set free, acquitted) from great transgression. פֶּשַׁע, from פָּשַׁע = פָּשַׁק (פָּשַׁע = פָּשַׁק), to free or extricate oneself, to break through the limit or bounds, is a collective name for the deliberate and dominant sins, that break through one's gracious relationship to God and therefore cast one out of the state of grace—in one word, apostasy. Finally the singer prays for a gracious acceptance of his prayer, in which mouth and heart accord, he himself being upheld by the rocklike faithfulness (צוּרִי) and redeeming love (גֹּאֲלִי, *redemtor, vindex* √גל, חל, to loosen, redeem) of his God. הָיָה לְרָצוֹן is a standing expression of the sacrificial Thôra (*e.g.* Lev. i. 3 *f.*). לְפָנֶיךָ,

which belongs according to Ex. xxviii. 38 to לרצון, stands, in conformity with the law of reserved parallelism, in the second member. Prayer is a sacrifice of the inner man. The heart as it meditates gives it form, and the mouth offers it, when it utters that which is clothed in words.

PSALM XX.

A PSALM OF SUPPLICATION FOR THE KING IN TIME OF WAR.

2 May Jahve answer thee in the day of trouble;
May the name of the God of Jacob set thee up on high,
3 Send thee help from the sanctuary,
And support thee from out of Zion!

4 May He remember all thy meal offerings,
And find thy burnt sacrifice fat! (*Selah*)
5 May He grant thee according to thine heart,
And fulfil all thy counsel!

6 We would exult in thy salvation,
And in the name of our God lift up a banner—
May Jahve fulfil all thy desires.

7 Now know I that Jahve affordeth help to His anointed,
He will answer him from His holy heaven
With the saving mighty acts of His right hand.

8 Some boast of chariots and some of horses,
But we, of the name of Jahve our God do we boast.

9 Those have sunk down and fallen,
Whilst we have risen up and stand steadfast.

10 Jahve, oh save!—
Let the King answer us in the day we call.

Psalm xix. is followed by Ps. xx., because the commencement of the latter is the echo, as it were, of the petition with which the former concludes; and Ps. xx. is followed by Ps. xxi., because they both refer, as prayer and thanks, to the same occurrence. Ps. xx. is an intercessory Psalm of the nation, and Ps. xxi. a Psalm of thanksgiving of the

nation, for its king. It is self-evident that these two Psalms form a couple that are closely connected together by unity of authorship and of reference. They both begin somewhat monotonously with synonymous parallelism of the members (xx. 2–6; xxi. 2–8); they then warm up and acquire a more lively colouring, when they come to speak of the foes of the king and the kingdom (xx. 7–9; xxi. 9–13); and both conclude with an ejaculatory cry to Jahve (xx. 10; xxi. 14). In both the king is apostrophised throughout long stretches (xx. 2–6; xxi. 9–13), here and there in a manner that raises the question, whether it is not rather Jahve that is addressed (xx. 6; xxi. 10). In both the king is referred to by הַמֶּלֶךְ (xx. 10; xxi. 8); both sum up the object of the nation's desires in the word יְשׁוּעָה (xx. 6; cf. *v.* 7; xxi. 2, 6); both delight in rare expressions, that occur only here within the Old Testament literature (נדגל, xx. 6; נתעודד, xx. 9; ארשת, xxi. 3; תחדהו, xxi. 7). Although they stood, as לדוד indicates, in the oldest Davidic psalter, still it is more probable that they have a contemporary poet rather than David himself as their author; for although they coincide in several respects both as regards diction (cf. xxi. 12 with x. 2) and thoughts (cf. xxi. 7 with xvi. 11) with Davidic Psalms, yet they stand apart by themselves as regards their peculiar character. That David, however, is the subject of them, as לדוד and their position in the midst of Davidic Psalms lead us to expect, may be established. David's deep fall, which both in itself and in its consequences made him sick in soul and body, happened during the war with Ammon and Syria. It was only after he had been restored by the help of God's grace from this self-caused great peril, that he joined his army which was lying before Rabbath Ammon, and brought to an end the conquest of the enemy's capital city. The situation of this couple of Psalms is explained most satisfactorily by 2 Sam. xi. and xii. Ps. xx. prays for the recovery of the king who is involved in war with powerful enemies, and

Ps. xxi. gives thanks to God for his restoration and wishes him a victorious issue in the campaign in which he is about to engage. The "chariots and horses" of xx. 8 are characteristic of the military power of Aram (2 Sam. x. 18 and freq.), and in xxi. 4 and 10 we detect allusions to 2 Sam. xii. 30, 31, or at least a noteworthy coincidence with what is related there.

Vers. 2–6. Intercession for the king who is in distress, and who causes sacrifices to be offered for himself in the sanctuary. The imperfects in *vv.* 2–5, five of which stand at the head of the parallel members the rhythm of which has a rise, are optatives; the יְמַלֵּא of *v.* 6 also continues the chain of wishes, in which even נְרַנְּנָה (cf. lxix. 15) is a link. Wishes of the nation accompany prayer and sacrifice. The name of the God of Jacob is the self-manifesting power and grace of the God of Israel; יעקב alternates poetically with ישׂראל, just as אלהים with יהוה. Alschêch refers to Gen. xxxv. 3; and it is not improbable that the desire is shaped in accordance with the fact the tradition of which is recorded there. May Jahve, who, as the history of Jacob shows, hears in the day of trouble, hear the king; may the name of the God of Jacob deliver him from his enemies and exalt him above them triumphantly. שִׂגֵּב alternates in this sense with רוֹמֵם (xviii. 49). This intercession in behalf of the suppliant is offered up in the sanctuary on the double summit of Zion, where Jahve is enthroned. May He from thence send him His assistance, like auxiliary troops that determine the victory. The king is sacrificing. He offers, as was customary before the beginning of a battle (1 Sam. xiii. 9 *ff*; cf. also the phrase קִדֵּשׁ מִלְחָמָה), a whole burnt-offering and therewith also meal offerings, מְנָחוֹת; at least, according to the sacrificial Thôra, it was necessary that each whole burnt offering and peace offering should be accompanied by a meal offering as well as by a drink offering. The verb זָכַר occurs very frequently in connection with the ritual of the meal offering. Only a

portion of the meal offerings (to which class, however, the accompanying meal offering, מנחת נסכים, which was devoted wholly to the altar, does not, according to traditional practice, belong) was laid upon the altar; that part which ascended in the altar-fire was called אַזְכָּרָה, *μνημόσυνον* (cf. Acts x. 4), *i.e.* that which brings him, in behalf of whom sacrifice is being offered, into remembrance with God; this expression does not mean "incense" (Hupf.), for the designation of the meal offering of jealousy in Num. v. 15 as "bringing iniquity to remembrance before God" proves that in the ritual of the meal offering זכר has no other meaning than what it has everywhere else. Every meal offering is in a certain sense a מִנְחַת זִכָּרוֹן. Accordingly there is combined here with the meal offerings the petition that Jahve would be pleased to remember them graciously. As regards the *'Olah*, the wish: "may fire from heaven (Lev. ix. 24; 1 Kings xviii. 38; 1 Chron. xxi. 26) turn it into ashes" (Kimchi) would not be inadmissible; but the language does not refer to anything extraordinary; דְּשֵׁנָה, as a denominative from דֶּשֶׁן, the ashes that remain after the burning of the flesh upon the altar, means "to cleanse from ashes," but not "to turn into ashes." On the other hand, דִּשֵּׁן also means "to make fat" (xxiii. 5); and in our passage this effective signification (LXX. *πιανάτω*, Symm. *πίονα ποιήσῃ*) is applied declaratively: may He find thy burnt offering fat, which is equivalent to, may it be רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ to Him. The voluntative *ah* occurs in the 3rd pers. only here and in Isa. v. 19 and Job xi. 16; here, as is the case also with the cohortative in 1 Sam. xxviii. 15, it changes the lengthening into a sharpening (cf. the similarly changed forms in 1 Sam. xxviii. 15, Isa. lix. 5, Zech. v. 4, Prov. xxiv. 14, Ezek. xxv. 13) and passes over into *éh*, just as מָה very frequently passes over into מֶה. The alteration יְדַשְּׁנָהּ or יְדַשְּׁנָה (Hitz.) gets rid of the exceptional form in a happy but unnecessary way. That the music has to swell in intensity here, is ex-

plained by the circumstance that this intercessory chorus is to be sung while the sacrifice is being laid upon the altar (הַקְטָרָה). עֵצָה is the resolution formed during the course of the present war. "Because of thy salvation," *i.e.* thy success in battle, is, like everything in this strophe, addressed to the king; cf. xxi. 2, where the same expression is used with reference to the victory granted him, but is addressed to Jahve. It is not necessary to read נְגִדְּלָה, after the *μεγαλυνθησόμεθα* of the LXX. and the Syr., instead of נִדְגַּל; נִדְגַּל is a denominative from דֶּגֶל: to wave a flag; the flag itself is so named from its being a covering, a cloth, *pannus;* the signification, to lie, to flatter, which דגל has in Arab. and Aram., proceeds from the primary meaning *tegere, oblinere* (دجل).[1] In the concluding line of the strophe the exultation arising from the hope of victory bethinks itself again of the present and becomes once more an intercessory desire.

Vers. 7–9. While *vv.* 2–6 were being sung, it is probable that the offering of the sacrifice was going on. Now, after a considerable pause, one voice is raised, very likely the voice of a Levite, and gives expression to the confidence that flashes up in their minds, that the sacrifice which has been offered by the priest has been graciously accepted. With עַתָּה or וְעַתָּה, the catch-word indicative of a crisis or turning-point, the instantaneous occurrence of the result of a somewhat lengthy physical or spiritual process (*e.g.* 1 Kings xvii. 24; Isa. xxix. 22) is introduced. הוֹשִׁיעַ is a perfect of faith, which, in the certainty of being heard, anticipates the fulfilment. The overflowing of consciousness that is expressed in

[1] In Assyr. *dagâlu* means to look, *diglu*, that towards which one looks. *Vid.* Friedr. Delitzsch in Lotz' *Inschriften Tiglathpilesers*, i. p. 131*f.* According to this meaning we should have to assume that the root of דֶּגֶל is lost in Heb. (Aram. and Arab.) and that the name for a flag goes back to the most primitive Semitic times; it is by no means permitted us, however, to make use of the Assyr. *dagâlu* for the purpose of explaining the נִדְגַּל of our passage.

v. 7 answers to the superabundance of expressions that are employed there. In *v.* 3 the answer is looked for from Zion, here, from God's holy heavens; for the God who is enthroned in Zion is enthroned for ever in the heavens; His royal seat upon earth is as it were the vestibule of His seat in heaven; His presence in the sanctuary of Israel is no limitation of His omnipresence; His help from Zion is help of the heavenly One and of Him who is exalted above the heaven of heavens. גְּבוּרוֹת does not here mean fulness of might (cf. xc. 10), strength, but the manifestations of power, the mighty acts (cvi. 2, cxlv. 4, cl. 2, Isa. lxiii. 15), whereby His right hand effects salvation, *i.e.* victory, for him who is in the thick of the battle. The glory of Israel is different from that of the heathen, which proves itself to be idle boasting. In *v.* 8 *a* הִזְכִּירוּ or יַזְכִּירוּ is to be supplied in thought from נַזְכִּיר in *v.* 8 *b*: הִזְכִּיר בְּ, to make laudatory mention of a matter, to praise it, and therefore indirectly to boast of it, glory in it (cf. הִלֵּל בְּ, xliv. 9). According to the law Israel was to have no standing army; and the law that was laid down for the king speaks warmly against his multiplying horses to himself (Deut. xvii. 16). Both during the time of the Judges and also in the reign of David these regulations were observed; but under Solomon, who acquired for himself a vast number of horses and chariots (1 Kings x. 26–29), matters already became different. It is therefore a confession, which harmonises with the time of David, that is made here in *v.* 8, that, as compared with their enemies, more especially the Syrians, Israel's glory is solely the sure defence and weapon of the name of their God. David speaks in the same way to Goliath (1 Sam. xvii. 45). The preterites in *v.* 9 are *præt. confidentiæ;* as Luther remarks, it is "a song of triumph before the victory, a shout of joy before the succour." Seeing that קוּם does not mean, to stand, but, to rise (Jer. *resurreximus*), קָמְנוּ presupposes the superiority at that time of their foes. But the state of the case becomes totally

different; the standing fall, those lying low rise; the former remain lying, the latter hold the field. Accordingly the "again" in the signification of וְנִתְעוֹדָד is not (with Hupf.) to be dropped. It is the reflexive of עוֹדֵד, "to raise up again" (cxlvi. 9, cxlvii. 6). The notion of continuance in עוד, عاد, is developed from the primary meaning, to turn and return.

Ver. 10. After this solo, we have now once more a chorus. The hymn concludes congregationally, as it had begun, and is rounded off by reverting to its original tone, praying for the fulfilment of that which has been besought and pledged. The most of the recent commentators (Hupf., Hitz. and others) follow the LXX. and the Vulg. in connecting הַמֶּלֶךְ with הוֹשִׁיעָה: *Domine salvum fac regem* ("God save the King"). The accentuation, however, connects המלך as a designation of God (who, it is true, is thus named so absolutely, *i.e.* without an attribute, only here) with יַעֲנֵנוּ as its subject; and the following reasons favour the correctness of this construction: (1) הוֹשִׁיעָה הַמֶּלֶךְ is a succession of vowel sounds (a final unaccented *ah* and an initial *ha*), which a poet would certainly have avoided, seeing he could have said הוֹשַׁע or הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא and מְשִׁיחֶךָ; (2) יענני after that "Jahve, oh save the king" would be a transition to the 3rd person, a reason for which we cannot discern. If we combine הושיעה המלך, we must, with Baethgen, follow the LXX. and the Vulg. in reading וְעַנֵּנוּ, in order to get rid of this inelegant synallage. But why in this prayer on behalf of the king should not Jahve Himself be called המלך at its close? The wish which is addressed to Him makes it impossible to misunderstand the reference of the designation. And its parallel position alongside of יהוה is but slightly different from the appositional construction אלוהי המלך in cxlv. 1.

PSALM XXI.

A PSALM OF THANKSGIVING FOR THE KING IN TIME OF WAR.

2 Jahve, because of Thy strength the king is glad,
And because of Thy salvation how greatly doth he exult!
3 His heart's desire hast Thou granted him
And the longing of his lips hast Thou not denied (*Selah*).

4 For Thou dost meet him bringing blessings of good,
Thou settest upon his head a crown of fine gold.
5 He asked life of Thee, Thou hast granted it to him,
Length of days for ever and ever.

6 Great is his honour by reason of Thy salvation,
Honour and glory Thou layest upon him.
7 For Thou settest him to be a fulness of blessing for ever,
Thou cheerest him with joy in Thy presence.

8 For the king trusteth in Jahve,
And through the grace of the Most High he shall not be moved.
9 Thy hand shall reach to all thy foes,
Thy right hand shall reach all them that hate thee.

10 Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven, when thou showest thyself,
Jahve shall swallow them up in His wrath and fire shall devour them.
11 Thou shalt destroy their fruit from the earth,
And their seed from among the children of men.

12 For though they cause evil to impend over thee,
Though they imagine a wicked device: they will accomplish nothing.
13 For thou wilt make them turn their backs,
With thy bow-strings thou wilt aim at their faces.

14 Exalt Thyself, Jahve, in Thy strength,
Singing and playing on the harp we will celebrate Thy might.

In the preceding Psalm, the people, interceding for their king, cried to him "may Jahve fulfil all thy desires"; in this they can say thankfully to God: "the desire of his heart hast Thou granted him." In both Psalms the people

appear before God in connection with matters that concern their king; in the former desiring and praying, in the latter thanking and hoping; here as well as there in the midst of war; here, however, now that the king has recovered, in the assurance that the war will be brought to a victorious issue. The Targum and the Talmud, *Succa*, 52*a*, understand this Ps. xxi. as referring to king Messiah. Raschi remarks that, because of the Christians, one should rather give up this Messianic interpretation. But even Christian exegesis cannot be disposed to maintain the Messianic interpretation in the rigid and direct manner of earlier days. The two Psalms treat of David; David's cause, however, in its way through suffering to victory, is typically the cause of the coming Christ.

Vers. 2, 3. In three tetrastichs, of which this is the first, the Psalm begins with thanks for the bodily and spiritual blessings which Jahve has granted to the king, and still grants, in answer to his prayer. עֹז (whence עֻזֶּךָ, as in lxxiv. 13, as well as עֻזְּךָ, lxiii. 3 and freq.) is the might that has been made manifest in succouring the king, the might that has turned his affliction, and יְשׁוּעָה, the help from above, that has raised him out of his straits and difficulties. The יגיל, which follows the מה of exclamation, is appropriately abbreviated by the *Kerî* into יָגֵל (the accent being also drawn back); cf. on the other hand Prov. xx. 24, where מה asks a question, but is negative in meaning. According to the context, the ἅπ. λεγ. אַרְשַׁת, from אָרַשׁ = Arab. ﻋﺮﺵ, *avidum esse*, has the signification, longing, yearning (LXX. δέησιν with the variant θέλησιν, Jer. *voluntatem*, Targ. פְּרוּשׁ = מְבָטָא, Num. xxx. 7). Note the strong negation בַּל: no, Thou hast not denied, but hast done the very opposite. The circumstance that the music has here to swell in intensity is favourable to the supposition that the Psalm has its occasion in the fulfilment of a prayer, the offering up of which was publicly known.

Vers. 4, 5. Blessings of good (Prov. xxiv. 25) are such blessings as have good, *i.e.* true good fortune, as their contents. The verb קִדַּם, being meant to be understood of the grace that comes to meet one with a blessing, is construed, after the manner of verbs of putting on and bestowing (Ges., § 139), with a double accusative. Seeing that 4*b* cannot refer to David's first coronation, but to the maintaining and augmenting of the honour of his kingdom, its singling out of one of the blessings promised in 4*a* sounds like a prophesy of 2 Sam. xii. 30: after the capture of Rabbah, the capital city of Ammon, David set upon his head the royal crown (עֲטֶרֶת) of Ammon, which is renowned as being heavy in gold and adorned with precious stones (Köhler, *Geschichte*, ii. 290*f.*). To make *v.* 5*b* refer, not to length of days, but to the bequeathing and transmission of his throne to his heirs, is contrary to the meaning of the words employed. It is quite common to wish one, more especially a king, that he may live לְעוֹלָם (1 Kings i. 31 and freq.). What is meant is, that the life of the king may be prolonged to an indefinitely distant date. That which the people desire elsewhere, they acknowledge here as being already bestowed upon the king.

Vers. 6, 7. The succour afforded him by God conduces to his honour and paves the way for him to honour, it makes him capable (this is what is meant by 6*b*) of maintaining and strengthening his kingdom in a way that brings him fame and glory. שִׁוָּה עַל, as in lxxxix. 20, said of divine instruction and endowment. "To set to be blessings, or a fulness of blessing" is a stronger way of expressing God's word to Abraham (Gen. xii. 2): be thou a blessing, *i.e.* at once a possessor of blessing thyself and the means of blessing others. Joy in (אֶת as in xvi. 11) the presence of God is joy in the most intimate and delightful fellowship with Him. חֶדְוָה, from חָדָה, which has already occurred once, viz. in Ex. xviii. 9, has, in the Arabic حدا, the signification (among the nomadic tribes) "to exhilarate and urge on the beasts of

burden by singing"; in Heb., as well as Aram. and Assyr., it has the general signification "to cheer, enliven."[1]

Vers. 8, 9. The second half of the Psalm begins with this strophe. The address to God passes over into an address to the king; not, however, into an address that expresses a desire that blessings may attend him, but into one that confidently looks for such. Hengstenberg rightly regards *v.* 8 as a transition to the second half; for by means of its objective statement regarding the king and God, this verse separates the preceding address to God from the following address to the king. We do not render 8*b* "and trusting in the grace of the Most High—he shall not be moved"; grace is the response to the trust which does not suffer him to be moved (for the expression, cf. Prov. x. 30). This inference is now unfolded with respect to the foes who would fain cause him to stumble and fall. Far from stumbling he rather assails his foes victoriously. If Jahve were addressed in this strophe, as Hupfeld maintains, then, in order that there might be a connection between *vv.* 8 and 9, the poet ought at least to have said אויביו and שׂנאיו (his, the king's, foes). That which the people hope for their king, they here express to him beforehand, as it were prophetically. מָצָא לְ (as in Isa. x. 10) and מָצָא *seq. acc.* (as in 1 Sam. xxiii. 17) are distinguished from one another as "to reach to" anything and to "reach" it. On the assumption that לְ represents the accusative (as *e.g.* in lxix. 6), 9*b* would be a useless repetition.

Vers. 10, 11. Up to this point the Psalm moves uniformly in synonymous dipodia; now it becomes agitated; and one discerns from its excitement that the king's foes are also the foes of his people. Although it is true that לְעֵת פָּנֶיךָ sounds like an address to Jahve (Hupf.), yet 10*b* shows us that this

[1] In Assyr. the word has an initial ḫ; *ḫidûtu*, *ḫudûtu*; *ḫudû* means joy (=חֶדְוָה); *vid.* Lotz, *Inschriften Tiglathpilesers*, i. p. 178.

is not really the case. The annihilating effect, which is elsewhere described as proceeding from the face of Jahve (xxxiv. 17, Lev. xx. 6, Lam. iv. 16; cf. ἔχει Θεὸς ἔκδικον ὄμμα), is here ascribed to the face, *i.e.* to the personal appearing (2 Sam. xvii. 11), of the king at the head of his army. David's arrival actually decided the fall of Rabbath Ammon, some of the inhabitants of which bled to death under iron instruments of torture, while others were cast into brick-kilns (2 Sam. xii. 26*f.*). The expression of the anticipation here is shaped in accordance with this fate of the Ammonites; כְּתַנּוּר אֵשׁ is a second accusative to תְּשִׁיתֵמוֹ: thou wilt make them (not him, the king, as Baethgen renders it) as a fiery oven, *i.e.* a burning oven, so that, like its contents (*synecdoche continentis pro contento*), they entirely consume by fire. The figure is only hinted at, and is meant in a different sense than in Lam. v. 10, Mal. iii. 19. *V.* 10*a* and 10*b* are intentionally two long lines that rise and fall like waves; they are followed in *v.* 11 by two short lines; the latter describe only the quiet gleaning after the divine fiery judgment that was executed by means of David. As in Lam. ii. 20 and Hos ix. 16, פִּרְיָמוֹ is to be understood after the analogy of פְּרִי הַבֶּטֶן. It is the fate of the Amalekites (cf. ix. 6*f.*), which is prophesied to the enemies of the king.

Vers. 12, 13. And this fate is the merited frustration of their wicked purpose. The construction of the clauses in *v.* 12 is the same as that in xxvii. 10 (according to Hupf. and Ew.; but *vid.* our comment on that verse) and cxix. 83 (Ew., § 362*b*); נָטָה רָעָה is not to be understood after the analogy of נָטָה יְרִישׁ (=פָּרַשׁ), for this latter phrase does not really occur; we must rather, with Hitzig, compare lv. 4, 2 Sam. xv. 14: to cause evil to impend upon any one is equivalent to, to aim at its falling in upon him and overthrowing him. נָטָה means to draw out lengthwise, to stretch, distend; but it also means to bend and incline by drawing tight. שִׁית שְׁכֶם, to make a back, *i.e.* to make them such as

turn the back to one, is a still more select expression than נָתַן עֹרֶף (xviii. 41; cf. 1 Sam. x. 9); here, in pause, the half segolate form (שִׁכְמֵם = שִׁכְמָם) becomes the full segolate form שִׁכְמָם. חִצִּים must be supplied in thought as an object to תָּכוֹן, as it is elsewhere after הוֹרָה, הִשְׁלִיךְ, יָרָה; כּוֹנֵן חֵץ (xi. 2; cf. vii. 14) means to direct, *i.e.* aim, the arrow that is lying upon the bowstring, מֵיתָר = יֶתֶר. The arrows hit the faces of the foes, inasmuch as the pursuer overtakes them.

Ver. 14. Now that the hymn has spread out its two wings through 2 × 3 tetrastichs, it closes with a distich, in which it as it were soars aloft and so loses itself. It is a cry to God with reference to the king, a cry for victory in the war. "Exalt Thyself," *i.e.* manifest Thyself in Thy supernatural (lvii. 6, 12) and judicial (vii. 7*f.*) sovereignty. That Jahve would reveal the גְּבוּרָה, to which everything that opposes Him must succumb,—that He would reveal it by bringing the world into subjection to Himself: this is what this concluding expression longs for, and it is this for which it vows beforehand a joyous gratitude.

PSALM XXII.

ELI ELI LAMA ASABTANI.

2 My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?
Far from my help is my suppliant cry.
3 O my God, I cry in the day-time, but Thou answerest not,
And in the night season, but find no rest.

4 Yet Thou art holy, enthroned upon the praises of Israel.
5 In Thee our fathers trusted,
They trusted, and Thou didst deliver them.
6 Unto Thee they cried and were set free,
Trusting in Thee, they were not put to shame.

7 I, however, am a worm and no man,
A reproach of men and despised of the people.
8 All that see me laugh in scorn at me,
Open wide the lips, shake the head:

9 "Roll it upon Jahve— let Him deliver him,
Let Him rescue him, if He delighteth in him."

10 Yea, Thou art He that drew me forth out of the womb,
Thou didst inspire me with trust upon my mother's breasts.
11 Upon Thee have I been cast from my birth,
From my mother's womb Thou art my God.
12 Remain not far from me, for trouble is near,
For there is none to help.

13 Powerful bulls have compassed me,
Strong ones of Bashan have beset me round.
14 They open their mouth wide against me—
A lion ravening and roaring.

15 I am poured out like water,
And all my bones are out of joint.
My heart has become like wax,
Molten in the midst of my bowels.
16 My strength is dried up like a potsherd,
And my tongue cleaves to my palate,
And Thou layest me in the dust of death.

17 For dogs have compassed me,
A crew of miscreants close me round,
Like a lion, my hands and feet.
18 I can count all my bones,
Those look, they feast their eyes on me.
19 They part my garments among them,
And upon my vesture they cast lots.

20 And Thou, Jahve, remain not Thou far off!
My strength, haste Thee to help me!
21 Deliver my soul from the sword,
My only one from the paw of the dog.
22 Save me from the lion's maw;
Yea; from the horns of the antelopes—Thou answerest me.

23 I will declare Thy name to my brethren,
In the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee:
24 "Ye that fear Jahve, praise Him;
All ye the seed of Jacob, glorify Him;
And stand in awe of Him, all ye the seed of Israel!"

25 "For He hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted,
Neither hath He hid His face from him,
And when he cried, He hath hearkened unto him."

26 From Thee cometh my praise in the great congregation—
My vows will I pay before them that fear Him.
27 The humble shall eat and be satisfied,
They shall praise Jahve that enquire after Him:
"Let your heart refresh itself for ever!"

28 All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto Jahve,
And all the families of the nations shall bow down before Thee.
29 For the kingdom is Jahve's and He is ruler over the nations.
30 All the affluent of the earth shall eat and bow down,
All that go down to the dust and they that do not prolong their life shall bend the knee before Him.
31 A seed shall serve Him: it shall be told of the Lord unto the (next) generation;
32 They shall come and declare His righteousness to a people that shall be born, that He hath accomplished it.

Psalm xxii. is a plaintive Psalm, whose deep complaints occasioned by the most shameful humiliation and the most fearful peril, stand in striking contrast with the calm and cheerful mood of Ps. xxi. It begins with a disconsolate shriek of anguish, advances to a cry for help that is full of trust, and ends in vows of thanksgiving and in an intuition of the world-embracing consequences which result from the deliverance of the suffering one. In no Psalm does such a measure of the most excruciating inward and outward sufferings press upon the mourner, notwithstanding his most perfect innocence. In this respect Ps. lxix. is its counterpart; but our Psalm differs from it in this, that there is not a word of imprecation mingling with its plaints.

It is David, who here struggles up out of the gloomiest depth to such a serene height. It is a Davidic Psalm belonging to the time when he was persecuted by Saul. Ewald brings it down to the time immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and Baur to the time of the Exile. Ewald says it is not now possible to trace the poet more

exactly. Maurer concludes: "illud unum equidem pro certo habeo, fuisse vatem hominem opibis præditum atque illustrem, qui magna auctoritate valeret non solum apud suos, verum etiam apud barbaros." Hitzig adheres to his view that Jeremiah composed the first half when cast into prison as a deserter, and the second half in the guard house, when transferred to this milder form of imprisonment; and according to Olshausen everything here also fits in with the times of the Maccabees. There is one consideration, however, which of itself deprives all these conjectures of any value. No man in the pre-Christian period, not even a prophet, could associate with the anticipation of his own deliverance the anticipation of the conversion of the heathen and the blessing of men by means of the gospel of this deliverance —no man could do so save the theocratic king who was faithful to his vocation, and who, more especially since 2 Sam. vii., could apply to himself what the patriarchal blessing says of Abraham's seed, that they that bless it should be blessed and they that curse it accursed, and who must have appeared to himself as being of central significance not only as regards the covenant people but also as regards the world at large. But in other respects also and from all points of view David, the persecuted by Saul, authenticates himself as the author. The petition אל־תרחק (xxii. 12, 20, xxxv. 22, xxxviii. 22, borrowed in lxxi. 12), the name given to the soul, יחידה (xxii. 21, xxxv. 17), the designation of quietness and resignation by דומיה (xxii. 3, xxxix. 3, lxii. 2; cf. lxv. 2) are regarded by us, who do not with Hitzig limit the genuine Davidic Psalms to Pss. iii.–xix., as peculiarly Davidic expressions. Nor are there wanting other coincidences with genuine old Davidic hymns (cf. xxii. 30 with xxviii. 1, those that go down to the dust, to the pit; then in later Psalms, as in cxliii. 7, in Isaiah and Ezekiel), especially with such as belong to the time of Saul, *e.g.* Ps. lxix. (cf. xxii. 27 with lxix. 33) and lix. (cf. xxii. 17 with lix. 15). The figures

taken from animals, which are heaped up in our Psalm, belong to the peculiar character of the Psalms of this period. That Ps. xxii. is an old-Davidic original is also confirmed by the parallels that are found in the later literature of the *Shîr* (lxxi. 5*f.* from xxii. 10*f.*; cii. 18*f.* after xxii. 25, 31*f.*), the *Chokma* (Prov. xvi. 3, גֹּל אל־ה׳, from Pss. xxii. 9, xxxvii. 5) and prophecy (Isa. xlix., liii.; Jeremiah in Lam. iv. 4, cf. Ps. xxii. 15; and other instances of the same kind). Notwithstanding these echoes of our Psalm in the later literature there are still some expressions occurring in it to which no parallels can be adduced from any other quarter, *e.g.* the hapaxlegomena, אַיָּלוּת and עֲנוּת. We have therefore no doubt as to the validity of the לדוד. David speaks in this Psalm, he and no one else, and that too out of his own inmost heart. In conformity with the nature of lyric poetry the Psalm has grown up on the soil and ground of his individual life and his individual feeling.

In the history of David, when persecuted by Saul, there is also really to be found a situation, which may have occasioned the picture of sorrow which is drawn in this Psalm, viz. in 1 Sam. xxiii. 25*f.* We are not acquainted with the more special circumstances of the straits to which he was reduced in the wilderness of Maon (to which time the Syriac according to *Cod. Ambros.* refers Ps. xvi.); but they did not by any means so coincide with the strange and gruesome traits of suffering depicted in this Psalm that the description given of these can be regarded as a historically faithful and literally exact copy of those circumstances; cf. on the other hand Ps. xvii. which was composed at the time referred to. No more can it be said that the anticipations, which he connects in this Psalm with his deliverance, were realized in David's life. On the other hand, the first half coincides with the passion of Jesus Christ, and the second with the consequences that have resulted from His resurrection. It is the agonizing situation of a crucified one that is pictorially and

faithfully presented to us in *vv.* 15–18: the spreading out of the limbs of the naked body, the torturing of the hands and feet, and the burning thirst which the Redeemer, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, announced in the cry διψῶ (John xix. 28). Men who reviled Him and shook their head at Him passed by His cross (Matt. xxvii. 39) just as *v.* 8 says; scorners cried to Him: let the God in whom He trusts deliver Him (Matt. xxvii. 43), just as *v.* 9 says; His garments were divided and lots were cast for His coat (John xix. 23*f.*) in order that *v.* 19 of our Psalm might be fulfilled. The third last of the seven words of the dying One, Ἠλὶ ἠλὶ κ.τ.λ. (Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34) is the first word of our Psalm and the appropriation of the whole. And the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 11*f.*) quotes *v.* 23 as the words of Christ, in order to show that He is not ashamed to call those His brethren, whose sanctifier God has appointed Him to be, just as the risen One has actually done (Matt. xxviii. 10, John xx. 17). We are far from having exhausted the reciprocal relations. The Psalm so sets before our eyes not merely the suffering of the crucified One, but also the redemption of the world that resulted from His resurrection and the sacramental appropriation of that redemption, *ut non tam prophetia, quam historia videatur* (Cassiodorus). For this reason the ancient Church considered, not David, but Christ to be the speaker in this Psalm, and condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, who interpreted it as referring to the times in which it was written. Bakius expresses the mind of the older Lutheran expositors, when he says: "asserimus, hunc Ps. ad literam primo, proprie et absque ulla allegoria, tropologia et ἀναγωγῇ integrum et per omnia de solo Christo exponendum esse." Even the Synagogue, so far as it recognizes a suffering Messiah, hears Him speaking here, and takes the "hind of the morning" as a name of the Shechinah and as a symbol of the dawning redemption. A magnificent Midrasch, which takes the complaints of Ps.

xxii. as complaints of the suffering Messiah, may be found in the *Jalkut Schim'ôni* to Isaiah, § 359.

For us, who look upon the whole Psalm as the words of David, it does not thereby lose anything of its prophetic character. It is a typical Psalm. The very same God, who communicates His thoughts of redemption to the spirit of man and there causes them to become the word of prophetic proclamation, has also so shaped history itself that it has become a prefigurative representation of the coming salvation; and the evidence for the truth of Christianity which may be deduced from these prophetic facts of history is no less convincing than that which may be deduced from verbal prophecy. That David, the anointed of Samuel, before he reached the throne, had to go a way of suffering which resembles the way of suffering of Jesus, the son of David baptized by John, and that this typical suffering of David is fixed for us in the Psalms as in images reflected from a mirror—this is also an appointment of divine power, grace and wisdom. But Ps. xxii. is not merely typical. For in the very nature of the type there is implied the difference between it and the antitype. In Ps. xxii., however, David descends with his complaints to a depth that lies beyond the depth of his suffering, and rises with his hopes to a height which lies beyond the height of the reward of his suffering. In other words: the figure of speech, hyperbole (مبالغة, *i.e.* description in colours laid on strongly), without which poetical diction would be tame and dull in the eyes of the Semite, is here taken into the service of the Spirit of God. The hyperbolical element is thereby changed into the prophetical. This elevation of the typical into the prophetical is, however, also psychologically explicable. Since David has been anointed with the oil of royal consecration and at the same time also with the Holy Spirit, the official Spirit of the kingship of promise, he looks upon himself as the Messiah of God, to whom the promises point; and in virtue of this

way of looking at himself in the light of the highest calling that could be assigned to one in connection with the history of redemption, the historical reality of his experiences becomes idealised to him, and both what he experiences and what he hopes for thereby acquire a depth and height of background which reach out into the history of the final and true Christ of God. In saying so we do not maintain that there was any passing over from his own personality to that of the coming Christ, which is declared by Hengstenberg, Tholuck and Kurtz to be psychologically impossible. No; looking upon himself as the Christ of God, he looks upon himself, if we may express ourselves in the language of the historical fulfilment, in Jesus Christ. He does not distinguish between himself and the coming One, but sees in himself the coming One, the image of whom does not till somewhat later detach itself from him, and whose history will completely coincide with all that is hyperbolical in the expressions that he employs. For as God the Father fashions the history of Jesus Christ in conformity with His own counsel, so His Spirit fashions also the statements of David, the type of the coming One, regarding himself, with a view to that history. By means of this Spirit, which is at once the Spirit of God and of the coming Christ, David's typical history, as he narrates it in his Psalms and more especially in this one, has acquired that ideal depth, transfiguration and intensity, in virtue of which it is far more than a mere statement of typical facts, penetrates to the root of these facts in the divine counsel, and grows to be the word of prophecy; so that, to a certain extent, it may rightly be said that Christ speaks here through David, inasmuch as the Spirit of Christ speaks through him and makes the prefigurative suffering of His ancestor the means whereby His own future passion is represented. Without the recognition of this irrefragable state of the case, Ps. xxii. can neither be understood nor sympathetically reproduced.

The title runs: For the Musician, upon (after) the Hind of the Morning's Dawn, a Psalm of David. Luther, referring to the fact that it was at night that Jesus was apprehended and brought before the supreme council, renders it: "concerning the hind (*Hinden*, for which the Ilfelder Psalterium[1] has *hynden*) which is early chased," for

> Patris Sapientia, Veritas divina
> Deus homo captus est horâ matutinâ.

This is certainly a fine improvement of the *ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἑωθινῆς* of the LXX. (Vulg. *pro susceptione matutina*), which is based upon a confounding of אילת with אילות (*v.* 20) and is explained by Theodoret: *ἀντίληψις ἑωθινὴ ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιφάνεια.* The Midrasch recalls to mind Cant. ii. 8 and the Targum the morning sacrificial lamb, which was offered as soon as the watchman mounted on the pinnacle of the Temple announced with the cry ברקאי the shining of the self-announcing rising sun (*Tamid*, iii. 2). According to traditional definition, אַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר is the early light which precedes the dawn, and whose first rays are compared to the antlers of a stag.[2] But although it is exceedingly natural in

[1] *Vid.* the account of it by Prof. Freyer in Luth. *Zeitschrift*, 1873, p. 417 ff.

[2] A determination of time, which occurs in the Jerusalem Talmud as well as in the Babylonian, runs thus: "from the hind of the morning's dawn till the east is lighted up." In the beginning of *J. Berachoth* it is explained: אילת השחר כמין תרתי קרני דנהורא סלקין ממדינחא ומנהרין לעלמא "like two horns of light, rising in the east and illuminating the world." It is true the hind does not have antlers like the stag; but even the *ἔλαφος* which was dedicated to Artemis, and which Hercules hunted, is called *χρυσόκερως*. The Arabs distinguish between سحر, the grey of the morning, *diluculum*, French *aube* (*alba*), and فجر, the morning red which succeeds it; and Fleischer shows (in Levy's *Chald. Wörterbuch*, ii. 578) that שחר really goes back upon the primary meaning, to be blackish, and especially to be black with a preponderance of white. In Assyrian *šêru* is the opposite of evening (*lilâtu*).

connection with this Psalm to take this title symbolically, yet it certainly forms no exception to the technico-musical meaning of the others, and Melissus (1572) already explains it correctly: "concerning the melody of a common song, the commencement of which was *Ajáleth Haschâhar*, *i.e.* the hind of the morning-red"; although at the same time it is possible that the choice of a melody which is so named is intended to point to the breaking of light through the night of affliction which is accomplished in this Psalm.

Looked at with reference to its line of thought, the Psalm falls into three sections, *vv.* 2–12, 13–22, 23–32, which are of symmetrical compass, consisting as they do of 21, 24, and 21 lines. Whether, within these three groups, the poet has still further divided his poem into strophes, is a question that must remain undecided; the seven long concluding lines, however, stand out from the third group as if they were the pedestal of the whole.

Vers. 2, 3. In the first section, *vv.* 2–12, the disconsolate cry of anguish, which begins here in *v.* 2 with a lamentation over prolonged desertion by God, struggles through to an incipient trustful prayer. The question with לָמָּה (as it is usually written instead of לָמָה before the letters א״הע, with the exception of xlii. 10, xliii. 2, and Job vii. 20, where it is exceptionally *Milel*,[1] cf. on x. 1) is not an expression of impatience and despair, but of surprise and yearning. The sufferer feels himself to be rejected by God; the feeling of divine wrath surrounds him entirely with darkness; and yet he knows himself to be united to God in fear and love; his present condition is wholly out of keeping with the real nature of his relationship to God; and it is this very contradiction that urges him to put the plaintive question, which rises from the lowest depths: why hast Thou forsaken me? But notwithstanding this feeling of desertion by God, the

[1] *Vid. Mose ha-Nakdan*, p. 5, ed. Frensdorff.

bond of love is not broken; the mourner calls God אֵלִי; urged on by the longing that God would grant him once more to feel this love, he calls Him אֵלִי אֵלִי. That plaintive question: why hast Thou forsaken me? is not without example elsewhere in the Psalms (lxxxviii. 15; cf. Isa. xlix. 14). The crucified One's desertion by God, however, is altogether unique, and must not be measured by that of David and of other sufferers who thus complain when they find themselves exposed to sore trial. The element which is common to His case and theirs is this, that behind the wrath which is felt there is hidden the love of God, which faith holds fast, and that, regarded in himself, he who thus complains is not an object of wrath, if for no other reason than this, that even while feeling the wrath he maintains his fellowship with God. The crucified One is even to His latest breath the Holy One of God, and the propitiation, for which He offers Himself, is God's own eternal gracious will, which is now being realised in the fulness of the times; but seeing that He submits Himself with the sin of His people and of the whole of humanity to God's judgment, it cannot be spared Him to experience God's wrath against sinful humanity as if He were personally guilty; and out of the infinite depths of this tasting of wrath, which in His case rests upon no mere appearance but upon the sternest reality,[1] there comes His complaint, which penetrates the wrath and appeals to God's love, ἠλὶ ἠλὶ λεμὰ σαβαχθανί, which the evangelists, omitting the πρόσχες μοι[2] inserted by the LXX., translate: Θεέ μου Θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες. He does not say לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי, but

[1] Eusebius remarks on *v.* 2 of our Psalm: δικαιοσύνης ὑπάρχων πηγὴ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνέλαβε καὶ εὐλογίας ὢν πέλαγος τὴν ἐπικειμένην ἡμῖν ἐδέξατο κατάραν, and: τὴν ὡρισμένην ἡμῖν παιδείαν ὑπῆλθεν ἑκών, παιδεία γὰρ εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν, ᾗ φησὶν ὁ προφήτης.

[2] *Vid.* Jerome's *Ep. ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi*, where he cries out to his carping critics, who were for adhering strictly to tradition: Reddant rationem, cur septuaginta translatores interposuerunt "respice in me"!

לָמָּה שְׁבַקְתָּנִי—He speaks in Aramaic, not in order that He may be understood by all, for such a consideration was foreign to Him then, but because Aramaic was His mother tongue—for the same reason that, when praying, He called God אַבָּא (*ἀββά*).[1] As *v.* 2 *b* says, God's forsaking of the mourner consists in this, that God's help and his cry for help lie far apart. שְׁאָגָה, referring properly to the roar of the lion (Aq. *βρύχημα*), is the loud shriek that is wrung from one by extreme pain (xxxviii. 9); here, however, as דִּבְרֵי shows, it is not an inarticulate cry, but a cry that bears aloft words of prayer to God. We must not take רָחוֹק as standing in apposition to the subject of עזבתני: far from my help, from the words of my roaring (Riehm); for in that case, seeing that מִי is not repeated, דברי שׁאגתי would be in apposition to מישׁועתי, for which, however, it is not adapted owing to its heterogeneousness. Hitzig accordingly attempts to get over this difficulty by means of the conjecture מְשַׁוְעָתִי ("from my loud cry, from the words of my groaning"). Nor may we explain it with Olshausen and Hupfeld after Aben Ezra: "my God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me, far from helping me" are (run) the words of my loud cry. This interpretation is contrary to the structure of the verse, the rhythm, and the usage of the language, and gives a tame and unlyrical beginning. רָחוֹק must, therefore, be taken, as in cxix. 155, as the predicate to דברי and going before it (*vid.* Ges., § 147 *b*), and we must render the clause with the older expositors (among the moderns, *e.g.* Baur): "far from my salvation," *i.e.* far from salvation becoming mine, "are the words of my loud cry"; there is a gulf between the two, inasmuch as God does not answer him who cries unceasingly. In *v.* 3 the place of אֵלִי, the divine name expressive of might, is taken by אֱלֹהַי, the name expressive of reverence, which is likewise rightly taken by the

[1] In Matt. xxvii. 46 ηλι ηλι (so the Targum), in Mark xv. 34, ελωι ελωι, *i.e.* אֱלָהִי (so the Syriac), are the readings supported by the best authorities.

old translators as a vocative and accordingly marked with *Rebia magnum*. It is not an accusative of the object, after the analogy of xviii. 4 (Hitz., Riehm), in which case the poet would have continued by saying וְלֹא יַעֲנֶה; that it is God, however, to whom he calls, is implied both by the address, אֱלֹהַי and by ולא תענה; for it is self-evident that he from whom one looks for an answer is also he to whom one has called. His uninterrupted crying remains without a response, without being stilled. The clause וְלֹא־דוּמִיָּה לִי is parallel to ולא תענה and therefore does not mean: without allowing myself any rest (Jer. xiv. 17, Lam. iii. 49), but: without any rest being allowed me, without my mourning being appeased or stilled (Job xxx. 27). From the sixth to the ninth hour, the earth had shrouded itself in darkness. About the ninth hour, after a long and more mental struggle, Jesus uttered that *ἠλὶ ἠλί*. The *ἀνεβόησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* of Matt. xxvii. 46 and also the *κραυγὴ ἰσχυρά* of Heb. v. 7, which does not refer exclusively to the scene in Gethsemane, remind us of the שׁוְּעָתִי of *v.* 2*b*. When the passion reached its crisis, days and nights of such wrestling had already preceded it; and that which then became audible was only an outbreak of the second David's conflict of prayer, which became ever keener as the catastrophe drew near.

Vers. 4–6. The sufferer reminds Jahve of the contradiction between his long-continued helplessness and His readiness to help, which has been so frequently and so speedily displayed. וְאַתָּה opens a circumstantial clause which sets forth an argument which is counter to that which the psalmist is having to experience: "although Thou art . . ." Jahve is קָדוֹשׁ, absolutely pure, literally, separated (√קד, גד, to cut, to sever), viz. from impurity, imperfection, sin; holiness is His physical and pre-eminently ethical faultlessness or perfection, to which belongs also His truthfulness and more especially the maintenance of the covenant relationship into which He has placed Himself with Israel. The ואתה קדוש is,

according to the biblical conception of the divine holiness, certainly not an appeal to God's might (Baudissin), but to God's inviolable truth, His stainless faithfulness.[1] As a Holy One in this sense He has also proved Himself, as the תְּהִלּוֹת of Israel, upon which or among which He is enthroned, aver. תהלות are the songs of praise which are offered to God, and that too in His sanctuary (Isa. lxiv. 10), because of His praiseworthy attributes and deeds (which are also themselves called תהלות, lxxviii. 4, Ex. xv. 11, Isa. lxiii. 7). The combination יוֹשֵׁב תְּהִלּוֹת (with the accusative of the verbs of dwelling and tarrying) is the same as יֹשֵׁב כְּרֻבִים in xcix. 1, lxxx. 2. The songs of praise, which resound in Israel as monuments of His saving deeds, are like Cherubs' wings, upon which His presence in Israel hovers. This graciously glorious self-attestation of God, who, as the Holy One, always from the remotest time acknowledged them, that honoured Him, in opposition to their persecutors, and justified their trust and vindicated the honour of His name, the suppliant brings to remembrance in *vv.* 5, 6. In *v.* 5 trust and deliverance are put in a relation of cause and effect; in *v.* 6 they are used interchangeably. פָּלְטוּ and מָלְטוּ are distinguished only by the greater hardness and softness of the labials; cf. xvii. 13 with cxvi. 4. That such thoughts stirred also in the soul of the crucified One as He prayed need not seem strange; for on the human side His divine-human consciousness was Israelitic; it is the God of Israel that is the God of salvation; redemption is that which has been determined by Himself; why, therefore, should He not speedily deliver the Redeemer!

Vers. 7–9. The sufferer complains of the greatness of his reproach, in order to move Jahve, whose own honour is thereby sullied, to come speedily to his assistance. Notwithstanding his cry for help, he is in the deepest affliction and

[1] *Vid.* my article *Heiligkeit Gottes* in Herzog-Plitt's R.E., v. 714 *ff.*

beyond all hope of recovery. Each word of *v.* 7 re-echoes in the second part of the Book of Isaiah. There, as here, Israel is called a worm (xli. 14); there all these traits of suffering are found in the picture of the Servant of God (xlix. 7; liii. 3, cf. l. 6), and more especially in lii. 14: "so marred was His visage, that He no longer looked like a man." תּוֹלַעַת (from תלע, to gnaw; cf. Frd. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 113) is the name given especially to the Kermes-worm (*vermiculus*, whence *color vermiculi*, *vermeil*, *vermiglio*); here, however, the salient point of the comparison is not the bleeding appearance, but the so utterly defenceless and the so thoroughly ignominious suffering. עָם is *gen. subj.*, like גּוֹי in Isa. xlix. 7. Jerome renders the ἐξουθένωμα λαοῦ of the LXX. excellently by *abjectio* (Tertullian: *nullificamen*) *plebis*, not *populi*. Luke uses the ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, with which the LXX. renders ילעיגו לי, in the history of the Passion (xxiii. 35; cf. xvi. 14); fulfilment and prophecy correspond so exactly, that the evangelical history can find no more adequate expressions than those offered by prophecy. In הִפְטִיר בְּשָׂפָה that which appears usually as the object of the action (to open the mouth wide, *diducere labia*) is thought of as the means whereby the action is performed, so that the verbal notion is complete in itself and implies its own object: to make an opening with the mouth; cf. פָּעַר בְּפָה, Job xvi. 10; נָתַן בְּקוֹל, lxviii. 34; Ges., § 138, 1, remark 3. As in cix. 25 (cf. xliv. 15, lxiv. 9), the shaking of the head is a gesture of surprise and astonishment at something unexpected and peculiar, not a προσνένειν assenting to the suffering inflicted upon another, although נוּעַ, נוּד, נוּט, νεύ-ω, *nu-t-o*, *nic-to*, *neigen* (to bend), *nicken* (to nod) all belong to the same family of roots. In *v.* 9 the words of the mockers follow without being introduced by לֵאמֹר. גָּל is not the 3rd pers. pret. (LXX. cf. Mat. xxvii. 43), like אוֹר, בּוֹשׁ; for it is not in the *Piel* (Jer. xi. 20, xx. 12, where גִּלִּיתִי = גִּלַּלְתִּי, Ew., § 121*a*) that גלל first becomes transitive, but it is so already in the

Kal; nor is it *inf. abs.* in an imperative sense (Hitz., Böttch.), although this form of the infinitive does occur, but always only as an *inf. intens.* (Num. xxiii. 25, Ruth ii. 16; cf. Isa. xxiv. 19); but in conformity with the parallels, xxxvii. 5 (where it is written גּוֹל), Prov. xvi. 3 (cf. Ps. lv. 23; 1 Pet. v. 7), it is *imper.*: roll, viz. thy suffering and thy doing upon Jahve, *i.e.* commit it to Him. The mockers cry out this גֹּל to the sufferer, and they say the rest regarding him with a malicious leer. כִּי in the mouth of the enemies is conditioning, "in case, provided that" (Hitz.), or even sarcastically assigning a reason for the foregoing statement, "for" (Riehm).

Vers. 10–12. On the ground of this his trust in God, which has been made an object of mockery, the sufferer prays that God would respond to it. With כִּי he confirms the reality of his loving relationship to God, which his foes deride; the intermediate thought, חָפַצְתָּ בִּי, which is not expressed, is made good; and by means of it כִּי acquires an affirmative signification. The verb גּוּחַ (גִּיחַ) means both, intransitively, to break forth (from the womb; Job xxxviii. 8), and, transitively, to push forth (cf. גֵּחֶה), more especially the fruit of the body (Mic. iv. 10). We might take it here in the first of these two significations: "my breaking forth" = "the cause of my breaking forth" (Hengstenb., Baur, and others); but there is no need of this metonymy; גֹּחִי is either a participle = גָּחִי, he that pusheth me forth, *i.e.* he that causeth me to break forth, or, seeing that there is no evidence for גּוּחַ in a causative signification and that such participles as בּוֹס, stamping, לוֹט, veiling, קוֹם, arising (Ges., § 72, remark 1), nowhere occur with suffixes, it is the participle of a verb גָּחָה, to draw forth (Hitz.), which perhaps only *per metaplasmum* takes the place of the *Pilel* גִּחַח with the awkwardly sounding מְגַחֲחִי (Ew., § 151 *a* towards the close). Ps. lxxi. 6 has גּוֹזִי instead of it, just as *v.* 5 of the same Psalm has מִבְטָחִי instead of מִבְטְחִי. The *Hiph.* מַבְטִיחַ does not mean

merely to cause to lie securely (Hupf.), but also to cause to trust. According to the biblical view there is already in the newborn child, yea even in the child which is as yet unborn and which is living only in the womb, a dawning consciousness which is gradually springing up out of the remotest depths of unconsciousness (*Psychol.*, p. 215). When, therefore, the suppliant says that from the womb he had been cast upon Jahve,[1] *i.e.* that he had been referred to Him alone with all his wants and concerns (lv. 23; cf. lxxi. 6), that from his mother's belly Jahve was his God, more is implied than the purely objective idea, that he grew up into such a relationship to God. He mentions his mother twice. Throughout the whole of the Old Testament there is no mention whatever of a human father, *i.e.* begetter, of the Messiah; it is always only His mother or bearer that is spoken of. The words of the one who is praying here also imply that, looked at with respect to its outward circumstances, the beginning of his life was poor and needy; and this likewise accords with the picture of Christ drawn in the Old Testament as well as with that in the New. On the ground of his fellowship with God, which reaches so far back, there is now (*v.* 12) raised the cry for help, which already runs through all he has as yet said, but which only now finds expression. The two כִּי stand upon the same footing. That the need is near, *i.e.* pressing, refers back antithetically to the petition that God would not remain far from him; no one helps, yea no one can help him save He alone. Here the first section comes to an end.

Vers. 13, 14. In view of his relationship to God, which has ever subsisted, the sufferer has become somewhat calmer,

[1] The *Hophal* has *o*, not *u*, perhaps in a more stative sense, a sense approximating somewhat to the reflexive (cf. Ezek. xxxii. 19 with xxxii. 32), rather than in a purely passive sense; the genius of the language seems to feel it so; *vid. Megilla*, 13 *a* (and also the explanation in *Tosafoth*).

so that he can now (*vv.* 13–22) describe his inner and outward life, and so relieve his heart. He here calls his enemies פָּרִים (√פר, to mount up, to leap), young bullocks, and indeed אַבִּירֵי בָשָׁן (cf. l. 13 with Deut. xxxii. 14) strong ones (from אָבַר = אבר, to be strong, *i.e.* vigorous, full-fed, agile) of Bashan, the land rich in luxuriant oak forests and fat pastures (בשׁן = *buthêna*, which in the Bedouin dialect means fat meadow-land, free from stones; *vid.* on Job, p. 557*f.*), lying north of the Jabbok and extending to the slope of Hermon, the land of Og and afterwards of Manasseh (Num. xxxii. 1). They are so called on account of their overbearing vigour and energy, which seeing it is acquired and used in a way that is hostile to God, is animal rather than human (cf. Amos iv. 1). Such ethical figures drawn from animals are explained by the fact that antiquity measured the instincts of the animal world by the ethical norms of human nature; in the last analysis, however, they are to be explained by the fact that, according to the undeniable biblical view, ever since man has been ruined by Satan by means of an animal, animal and Satan are the two powers dominant in Adamic humanity. כָּתַר is a synonym of סָבַב; its meaning, however, is much stronger.[1] On 14 *a* cf. the echoes in Jeremiah (Lam. ii. 16, iii. 46). Finally, his enemies are all comprehended under the figure of a lion, which, when it comes in sight of its prey, begins to roar (Amos iii. 4). The Hebrew טָרַף, *discerpere*, agrees in its two last radicals with the kindred חָרַף, *carpere*. They are *instar leonis dilaniaturi et rugientis*.

Vers. 15, 16. He now describes how, in such an environment, though still alive, he is already as it were dead. When he speaks of being poured out like water, we recall to

[1] Aquila translates διεδηματίσαντο, and Eusebius remarks upon it: *αἰνιττομένου τοῦ λόγου τὴν τοῦ Πιλάτου στρατιωτικὴν τάξιν ἣν Βασὰν ὠνόμασεν, οἳ στέφανον* [כֶּתֶר] *ἐξ ἀκάνθων πλέξαντες ἀντὶ διαδήματος ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ.*

mind the ignominious abandonment of the crucified One to a condition of weakness, in which His life, deprived of its natural support, is in the act of dissolution and His strength is decayed (2 Sam. xiv. 14); at the mention of the fact that his bones are out of joint, we remember the violent stretching out of His body (הִתְפָּרְדוּ, from פָּרַד, to spread, unfold; cf. فرى in its primary signification, which the common Arabic dialect has preserved: so to stretch or strain that the article has no bends and folds,[1] Greek ἐξαπλοῦν); while the melting of the heart reminds us of His burning anguish, the inflammation of His wounds and the pressure of the blood to His head and His heart, which is the real cause of death by crucifixion. נָמַס, in pause נָמָס, is 3rd pers. *pret.* (as in Ezek. xxi. 12) after the analogy of the form נָקַל (instead of נָמַס, נָקַל). Wax, דּוֹנַג, receives its name from its melting (דנג, √דג, דאג). In *v.* 16 the comparison כַּחֶרֶשׂ is meant eventually (*vid.* xviii. 43): my strength is dried up, so that it is become like a potsherd. Instead of חִכִּי, כֹּחִי (Saadia) commends itself, unless כֹּחַ perhaps, like the Talmudic כִּיחַ, had also the meaning "spittle" (as a more dignified word for רֹק). With the doubtful exception of Prov. xxvi. 28, לָשׁוֹן is everywhere feminine; here the predicate, instead of agreeing with the subject, has the masculine primary form; in general there is a tendency to use the *part. pass.* without reference to gender, under the influence of the construction in Ges., § 143, 1 *b*, according to which לשׁוני may be taken as an accusative of the object. מַלְקוֹחָי, however, is *acc. loci* (cf. לְ, cxxxvii. 6, Job xxix. 10; אֶל, Lam. iv. 4, Ezek. iii. 26): my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws, *fauces meas.* Thus matters stand with him in consequence of outward distresses. His foes, however, would not have had power, had not God given it to them.

[1] *Vid.* Bocthor, *Dict. franç.-Arabe*, s. v. *Étendre* and *Déployer*. The reading, הִתְפָּרְדוּ, assumes here a passive of the reflexive of the *Kal* like הִתְפַּקְּדוּ. *Vid.* Nöldeke in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 458–60.

It is, therefore, God Himself, who makes his bed in death; שָׁפַת, to put down, to lay down, with the secondary notion of firmness, duration, ثبات (Isa. xxvi. 12); the imperfect is the impf. of that which is in the act of happening. In the same manner the death of the Servant of God appears in Isa. liii. not merely as something that befell Him, but as a destiny, and not merely as something divinely permitted, but as purposed, determined by God. David is pursued by Saul, the king of his people, almost unto death; Jesus, however, is delivered over by the Sanhedrim, the authority of His people, to the heathen, under whose hands He actually dies the death of the cross; it is a judicial murder carried out in accordance with the conditions of the time; in its ultimate ground, however, it is a gracious appointment of the holy God, in whose hand all the threads of universal history meet as their common centre, and who here makes sin subservient to its own expiation.

Vers. 17–19. A continuation, referring back to *v.* 12, of the complaint of him who is dying and already as it were dead. In the animal name כְּלָבִים, which is used figuratively as descriptive of character, besides the idea of shamelessness and vileness, special prominence is given here to the trait of being given to biting and hunting, *i.e.* persecuting, whence Symm. and Theod. render it *θηράται*, *κυνηγέται*. In 17 *b* the place of כלבים is taken by עֲדַת מְרֵעִים, which is followed by הִקִּיפוּ (to do anything in a circle, to surround in a circular form, a climactic synonym, like כָּתַר, of סָבַב) in the plural, either *per attractionem* (cf. cxl. 10; 1 Sam. ii. 4), or because of the collective sense of עֵדָה. Tertullian renders it: *synagoga maleficorum*, Jerome: *concilium pessimorum*. But עֵדָה is the name also for a company of men banded together for some evil purpose, *e.g.* עֲדַת קֹרַח. In 17 *c* the meaning of כַּאֲרִי, *instar leonis*, is either that, selecting a point of attack, they make the round of his hands and feet, just as a lion makes the round of its prey, upon which it throws itself as soon as

it begins to stir, or that, standing round about him like lions, they make defence impossible to his hands, escape impossible to his feet. Still, whether we take it as an accusative of the member in addition to the accusative of the person (*vid.* xvii. 11) or as the object of a הִקִּיפוּ, which is to be supplied from 17 *b*, this יָדַי וְרַגְלָי is grammatically harsh and dragging. Recognizing this, the Masora to Isa. xxxviii. 13 remarks, that in the two passages in which it occurs (Ps. xxii. 17, Isa. xxxviii. 13), כָּאֲרִי occurs in two different senses (כבתרי ליישני), just as the Midrasch also understands the כארי in our Psalm as a verb used of marking with charming, magic characters.[1] Is the Masora of opinion that כָּאֲרִי in our passage is equivalent to כָּאֲרִים? In that case the form would be doubly Aramaic: both in respect of the participial form כָּאַר (which occurs in Heb. only in verbs *med. E.*) and the apocopated plural, the occurrence of which in Heb., it is true, is to be acknowledged with Gesenius and Ewald in a few cases (*vid.* xlv. 9 and cf. on the other hand 2 Sam. xxii. 44), but which would be here the most easily misunderstood caprice. If כארי is to be understood as a verb, we must read כָּאֲרִי. In regard to this matter tradition is manifestly uncertain. Even in MSS. we find the readings כָּאֲרוּ and כָּאֲרִי. The former is borne witness to, both by the Masora to Num. xxiv. 9 and

[1] Hupfeld suspects that Masoretic remark (כָּאֲרִי ב׳ קמצין בתרי ליישני) to be a Christian interpolation; but in my *Complutensische Varianten* (1878) I have put it beyond doubt that it belongs originally to the alphabetical Masoretic register of the ב׳ ב׳ ותרויהון בתרי ליישני. Elias Levita already found this בתרי ליישני, and, without doubting its genuineness, is surprised at it (in c. 10 of his מסרת המסרת). In his edition of the Pentateuch, מאור עינים, Heidenheim also cites it on Num. xxiv. 9 (cf. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 24, note 3) and, without expressing any suspicion regarding it, confesses the insufficiency of his knowledge as to its meaning; and down to the present day no suspicion has been expressed on the part of Jewish scholars, although they have made all kinds of unsatisfactory attempts at explaining it (*e.g.* in the periodical *Biccure ha-'Ittim*).

by Jacob ben Chajim in the *Masora finalis*, as a manuscript *Chethib*.[1] But even apart from this, the *recepta* כָּאֲרִי has all the old witnesses against it. The Targum, which renders it *mordent sicut leo manus et pedes meos*, already vacillates between the substantival and the verbal apprehension of the word. The other old versions translate כארו. Aquila in the first edition of his translation rendered it ὤρυξαν (from כאר = Syr. ; Aram., Talm. כָּאַר, to disfigure, mar, render odious), but this does not suit "hands and feet." In the second edition of his translation the same Aquila, like Symmachus, had instead of this: "they have bound," after כר, כָּרַר, to twist, lace, according to which Jerome has rendered it *vinxerunt* (corrupted by copyists into *finxerunt*, and afterwards corrected into *fixerunt*);[2] but Hebrew has other words for "to bind," *constringere*. On the other hand no valid objection can be taken to the rendering of the LXX.: ὤρυξαν (Pesch. Syro-Hex. , Vulg. *foderunt*); for (1) even if we do not assume any such verb as כָּאַר, yet כארו, instead of כָּרוּ (כוּר) = כָּרוּ (כָּרָה), may either be written כָּאֲרוּ, like קָאֲמוּ in Hos. x. 14, instead of קָמוּ, or even pronounced כָּאֲרוּ, like קָאֲמָה (Zech. xiv. 10) and קָאֲמָיְא (Dan. vii. 16). And (2) that כּוּר and כָּרָה can signify not only to dig out and to dig in, but also to dig through, is shown not only by the derivative מִכְרֶה, but also by the same double meaning of the verbs נָקַר, ὀρύσσειν (*e.g.*

[1] The statement כארי ידי ורגלי כארו כתיב is not without manuscript attestation (*e.g.* Cod. de Rossi, 337); it has, however, other statements of the Masora against it, *e.g.* the statement that כַּאֲרִי occurs twice (Num. xxiv. 9, Ezek. xxii. 25) and כָּאֲרִי twice (Ps. xxii. 17, Isa. xxxviii. 13). In his edition of the Psalter (1650), Ant. Hulsius has written כארו in the margin, after the Complutensian text.

[2] Abraham of Zante in his rhymed paraphrase of the Psalter paraphrases גַּם כָּאֲרִי יָדַי וְרַגְלַי אָסָרוּ. The want of a verb is too perceptible. Saadia supplies it differently: "they surround me like a lion, in order to crush my hands and feet." Krochmal and Dyserinck correct כארי into כָּאֲבוּ, Grätz into אָסְרוּ.

ὀρύσσειν τὸν ἰσθμόν, Herod. i. 174), *fodere* (*hastâ*). The root כר combines the meanings "to dig" (*e.g.* كَرَى الا نهار, the proper expression for forming channels) and "to round" (*e.g.* כִּכָּר = כִּרְכָּר, Arab. كرّ, iterative كَرْكَرَ, to rebound in a circular movement, cog. גל, כל), originally signifying so to dig out or cut out that a roundish hollow is produced (cf. the English "*to carve*," to cut out in a circular form, and the Arab. كَوَّرَ الفارس, to throw a rider in such a manner that he falls to the ground rolled together as it were into a round ball). If we read כָּאֲרוּ (כְּאֵרוּ), then 17 *c*, as applied to David, and perhaps with the comparison of his foes to assailing dogs still present to the poet's mind (Böhl), declares that the miscreants have deprived him of the free use of his hands and feet by piercing them, so that he cannot escape and is abandoned to their horrible lusts.[1] The fulfilment by the nailing of the hands and (at least the binding fast) of the feet of the crucified One is exceedingly plain. Not only here is it prophesied that the coming Christ will be murderously pierced, but also in Isa. liii. 5, where He is said to be pierced through (מְחֹלָל) because of our sins, and in Zech. xii. 10, where Jahve represents Himself as being ἐκκεντηθείς in Him. אֲסַפֵּר is *potentialis*. Above in *v.* 15 he said that his bones were torn out of their sockets. Just as that cannot be meant of writhing in anguish, so this "I can count . . ." cannot be meant of emaciation because of grief; he can count them, because he is violently stretched out, and thereby all his bones stand out. In this condition he is a subject of mockery to his enemies. הִבִּיט signifies the turning of one's looks to anything, רָאָה בְּ the fixing of one's eyes upon it with delight. In *v.* 19 a new feature is added to those that transcend the

[1] So also Baethgen: this כארו, the best attested reading, is to be understood of the gaping wounds, which are made in the sufferer's hands and legs and which stare him in the face like holes.

condition of David: they part my garments among them . . .; it is not said that they intend doing so; they do so not merely in their imagination, they do it in reality. This never happened to David, or at least not in the literal sense of his words, in which it happened to Christ. *V.* 19 *a* and 19 *b* have literally fulfilled themselves in Him: the parting of the בְּגָדִים in the soldiers apportioning His ἱμάτια in four parts among themselves, the casting of lots upon the לְבוּשׁ in their not dividing the χιτὼν ἄῤῥαφος, but casting lots for it (John xix. 23 *f.*). לְבוּשׁ (from לבשׁ, לבּשׁ, √לב, לב, to lie close to, to adhere to, from which also the signification, to mix, mingle, *i.e.* to cause one thing to adhere to another, proceeds) is the garment which is laid closely and tightly upon the body, in order that it may not be naked; בְּגָדִים, the drapery, which one wraps round one's self, in order to be enveloped therein; for which reason לבוּשׁ is explained wittily in *Sabbat* 77 *b* by אל בושׁה (that whereby one needs not to be ashamed of one's nakedness) in distinction from גלימא, mantle (that whereby one appears כגולם, because it conceals the outlines of the body). In Job xxiv. 7 also, and frequently, לְבוּשׁ is the undergarment or shirt, that which in Arabic is bluntly called ثوب, *thôb*, "the garment," or to express it in Latin, the *tunica* as distinguished from the *toga* (מְעִיל). The case stands with *v.* 19 of this Psalm exactly as with Zech. ix. 9 (cf. Matt. xxi. 5); in regard to it also the fulfilment has realised that which is apparently identical from both sides of the synonymous expression.

Vers. 20–22. In *v.* 19 the description of suffering has reached its climax, for the dividing of the garments and the casting of lots for them assumes the certain death of the sufferer in the mind of his enemies. With וְאַתָּה in *v.* 20 the looks of the sufferer, notwithstanding the many tortures to which he is subjected, concentrate themselves all at once upon Jahve. He calls him אֱיָלוּתִי (a *nomen abstr.* from אַיָּל,

lxxxviii. 5): the essence of strength, as it were the idea or ideal of strength; as in lxxi. 12 (cf. on the other hand xxxviii. 23), *le'-ezrāthi* has the accent upon the penult, in order that two tone-syllables may not come together. חוּשׁ, to hasten, is the same word as the Bedouin حاس, *impf. u*, which signifies violent, impetuous movement, and from which *e.g. el-ahwas*, the swift runner, is formed (*D. M. Z.*, xxii. 159*f.*). In *v.* 21 חֶרֶב, by way of example, means the murderous weapons of the enemies. In מִיַּד כֶּלֶב, מִיַּד is not merely equivalent to מִן, but יָד is in meaning equivalent to paw (cf. כַּף Lev. xi. 27), just as פִּי is equivalent to maw; although elsewhere not only the hand of the lion and the bear (1 Sam. xvii. 37), but also the hands of the sword (Ps. lxiii. 11) and even the hand of the flame (Isa. xlvii. 14) are spoken of, יד being a general designation of that which is instrumental in acting, seizing and overmastering. Just as, in the case of the dog, יד, and in the case of the lion, פִּי (cf. however Dan. vi. 28) is mentioned as the weapon of attack, so in the case of the antelopes (רְמִים, a shorter form for רְאֵמִים, xxix. 6, Isa. xxxiv. 7, and occurring only here), the horns, not (and this applies also to Deut. xxxiii. 17) the horn. Nevertheless Luther following the LXX. and the Vulgate renders it: deliver me from the unicorns (*vid.* thereon notes on xxix. 6). As the parallel member here and in xxxv. 17 shows, יְחִידָה is a designation of the נֶפֶשׁ. In both passages the LXX. renders it correctly *τὴν μονογενῆ μου*, Vulg. *unicam meam*, after the analogy of Gen. xxii. 2, Judg. xi. 34, the one soul, besides which man has no second, the one life, besides which man has no second to lose; with a subjective turn given to it: soul or life as the dearest and most precious of all his possessions (cf. Homer's *φίλον κῆρ*). Some explain it, after the analogy of xxv. 16, lxviii. 7: my solitary one, *solitariam*, the soul as forsaken by God and man, or at least by man, and secluded in itself (Hupf., Kamphausen and others). But the parallel נַפְשִׁי and the analogy of

כְּבוֹדִי (= נַפְשִׁי) stamp it as a general name for the soul: the single one, *i.e.* that which does not exist in duplicate, the loss of which is therefore irreparable. The preterite עֲנִיתָנִי (for which the LXX., Syr., Symm. read substantively *τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου*, which is not suitable as an object to *σῶσον*; Thrupp is happier in his conjecture, עֲנִיָּתִי, my poor soul) might be equivalent to עָנָנִי, provided it is a *perf. consec.* separated from its *waw conversive* in order that מִקַּרְנֵי רֵמִים may stand at the head of the clause for the sake of emphasis; but even Riehm has not succeeded in pointing out a homogeneous example of such syntax. We cannot speak here any more than in iv. 2 of the perfect as being precative; in view of the turn which the Psalm takes in *v.* 23, we take עניתני with Driver (*Hebrew Tenses*, § 20, note 3) as a *perf. confidentiæ*, inasmuch as even while he is praying there arises in the mind of the suppliant the assurance that he is answered. "To answer from the horns of the antelopes" is equivalent to "to answer by delivering from them;" cf. the similarly pregnant עָנָה בְּ in cxviii. 5, perhaps also Heb. v. 7. On רְאֵם *vid.* on xxix. 6.

Vers. 23, 24. In the third section, *vv.* 23–32, the great plaintive prayer concludes with thanks and hope. In the assurance of being answered, there follows the vow of thanksgiving. His fellow-countrymen who are connected with him not only by ties of nature, but also, as the following expression, "ye that fear Jahve," shows, by spiritual ties, he calls "brethren." קָהָל (קָהַל, or even, like the Æthiopic, קָלָה, 2 Sam. xx, 14 √קל, *καλ-έω*, *cal-o*) coincides with *ἐκκλησία*. The sufferer is conscious of the significance that his lot of suffering has in connection with the history of redemption. He will, therefore, make the salvation, which has been granted him, common property. The community shall hear the gospel of his deliverance. In *v.* 24 there follows the preamble of this proclamation of salvation, a proclamation which is addressed to the whole of Israel, so

far as it fears the God of revelation. Instead of וגורו the text of the Orientals (מדנחאי), *i.e.* the Babylonian Jews, had here the *Chethîb* יגורו with the *Kerî* וְנִגּוֹרוּ; the jussive (xxxiii. 8) after the two imperatives would not be unsuitable. גּוּר מִן (= יָגֹר) is a stronger form of expression for יָרֵא מִן (xxxiii. 8). The verb גּוּר means *declinare*, and thence either *devertere* (whence מָגוֹר, dwelling, lv. 16; cf. *diversorium*) or (cog. יָגֹר, Arab. *waǵira*) *reformidare*, to go timidly out of the way, to be shy or timid.

Ver. 25. This tristich is the gospel itself, which the Psalmist has to proclaim. The *materia laudis* is introduced by כִּי. עֱנוּת (*stat. absol.* עָנוּת), bending, bowing down, suffering, from עָנָה, the proper verb for describing the Passion; for in Isaiah also (liii. 4, 7) the Servant of God is represented as מְעֻנֶּה and נַעֲנָה and Zechariah also introduces Him as עָנִי and נוֹשָׁע (ix. 9). The LXX., Vulgate and Targum erroneously render it: loud cry; עָנָה does not mean to cry, but to reply, *ἀμείβεσθαι*; here, however, as the word from which ענות is derived, it means to be bent; cf. the Chald. עֲנָן, sufferer, from עָנִי (Dan. iv. 24). From שִׁקּוּץ (to consider an abomination), which alternates with בָּזָה, we see that the sufferer felt God's wrath; but this transformed itself into helping love; God did not long hide His countenance from him; He hearkened to him, for his supplication was well-pleasing to Him. שָׁמֵעַ is not a verbal adjective, but, seeing a definite fact of deliverance is set before us, a pausal form for שָׁמַע, as in xxxiv. 7, 18, Jer. xxxvi. 13.

Vers. 26, 27. The proclamation of thanksgiving is now ended; there follows a grateful looking up to the author of salvation; and this grateful upward look becomes prophetical anticipations with regard to the future. That the sufferer can thus glory and render thanks in a great congregation (xl. 10) proceeds from Jahve (מֵאֵת as in cxviii. 23; cf. lxxi. 6). According to Baer's correct accentuation, the first half of the verse concludes with בְּקָהָל רָב, which is preceded

by תְּהִלָּתִי with *Dechi*. יִרְאָיו does not refer to קָהָל, but, as everywhere else, when the language of prayer passes over into a declaratory statement, it is to be referred to Jahve. There is no need to assume in our passage, that in the mind of David the paying of vows is a purely ethical and not a ritual act. Having been delivered he will bring the due שַׁלְמֵי נְדָר, the thank-offerings, which he vowed to God when in mortal danger. After the sprinkling of the blood (זְרִיקָה), and the laying of the fat pieces upon the altar (הַקְטָרָה), the remaining flesh of the schelamim was appropriated by the offerer for joyous feasts, for which, in the case of the thoda-schelamim sacrifice, the day of offering on into the night was allowed, in the case of the schelamim that were offered in connection with the vows, the following day also (Lev. vii. 15*f.*). The invitation of the poor to participate in these feasts, although not commanded by the law, is obviously suggested by these legal enactments, and is expressly recommended by other analogous prescriptions regarding the second and third tithes. To this *v.* 27 refers: he will invite the עֲנוִים, the spiritually and outwardly poor, to this "eating before Jahve"; it is to be a feast, for which they thank God, who has bestowed it upon them by means of this delivered one. *V.* 27 *c* is as it were the host's benediction upon his, or rather Jahve's guests through him; "may your heart live for ever," *i.e.* may this meal impart to you refreshment that will endure eternally. יְחִי is the optative of חָיָה, here used of the reviving of the heart, which is as it were dead (1 Sam. xxv. 37), in spiritual joy. The reference to the ritual of the schelamim is evident. And it is not less evident that there is set forth here the blessing that proceeds from the salvation, which has fallen to the lot of the sufferer, for all who are susceptible of salvation. But it is equally plain, that this blessing consists in something much higher than the material advantage, which participation in sacrificial animals imparts; the sacrifice is apprehended spirit-

ually, so that its outward form is reduced as it were to a mere figure of its essential nature; what is really treated of here is a spiritual enjoyment of spiritual and ever-enduring consequences. How natural it is to think here of the sacramental eucharist, in which the second David, having like the first attained to the throne through the suffering of death, makes us participate in the fruits of His suffering!

Vers. 28–32. The long line closing strophe, which forms as it were the pedestal of the whole, shows how far not only the description of the suffering of him who speaks here, but also the description of the consequences that follow from his deliverance, transcend David's historical reality. As the fruit of his proclamation of that which Jahve has done to and for him, the sufferer looks for the conversion of all peoples. The heathen have become unmindful and will again remember; the object, in itself clear (ix. 18), becomes evident from what follows: there is a γνῶσις τοῦ Θεοῦ (*Psychol.*, pp. 346 *ff.*) in the heathen-world which will be brought back into their consciousness by the proclamation of the deliverance of this sufferer.[1] This anticipation (cf. Jer. xvi. 19 *ff.*) is grounded in *v.* 29 (cf. Jer. x. 7) upon Jahve's kingly right to all peoples. A ruler is called מֹשֵׁל as being the one who stands aloft in virtue of his official position (מָשַׁל according to its primary meaning = مثل *erectum stare*, syn. נָצַב, *vid.* on cx. 4; cf. עָמַד, Mic. v. 3). In וּמֹשֵׁל the participle makes its appearance, in exactly the same way as the 3rd pers. *præt.*, without anything to mark the person (cf. vii. 10, lv. 20; Driver, *Tenses*, § 135, 6), as an expression of the pure present, and, so to say, as *tempus durans*: He rules over the nations (ἔθνη). The conversion of the heathen by means of that proclamation will therefore be a realization of the kingdom of God. Mention is again made of eating. In the eating and prostrating themselves before God, Grätz finds the "crassest

[1] Augustine, *De Trin.* xiv. 13: *Non igitur sic erant oblitæ istæ gentes Deum, ut ejus nec commemoratæ recordarentur.*

nonsense." Not only he and Pinsker, but also Bruston and Baethgen turn אכלו into אך לו, at the same time obliterating the following ו; but this is contrary to all the ancient versions. The received text, which is attested by all the authorities without exception, is not only not meaningless, but even highly significant. The perfect אָכְלוּ and the consecutive impf. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ are related to one another as cause and effect (Driver, § 81, *extr.*). What is meant is, as is evident from *v.* 27, an eating which is spiritually satisfying, and that too an eating which is brought about by God's great deed of deliverance. At the close of Ps. lxix., where the form of the ritual thank-offering is straightway broken, רָאוּ (*v.* 33) takes the place of אָכְלוּ. There it is the beholding of one, who has been delivered and who glorifies God with thankful heart, that leads to others rejoicing with him in the salvation he has experienced; here it is an actual enjoyment of it themselves, the joy of thanksgiving manifesting itself not merely in words, but in a thank-offering meal, at which those in Israel who are hungering and thirsting after salvation are the guests (for in Israel it is the acknowledgment of the mighty deed of a God already confessed); among the heathen, however, the guests are men of the most widely different conditions, the richest and the poorest; for among them it is a grace unexpectedly brought to them, and which is therefore embraced by them so much the more gratefully. The meal will be so sumptuous that all the דִּשְׁנֵי־אֶרֶץ, *i.e.* those who are distinguished among the inhabitants of the world and of their own country by the superabundance of their temporal possessions (for the use of ארץ in this enhanced sense cf. lxxv. 9, lxxvi. 10, Isa. xxiii. 9), prefer it to this superabundance, in which they might revel, and on account of the grace and glory, which the enjoyment thereof implies, prostrate themselves adoringly. Over against the "fat ones (cf. οἱ παχέες, παχεῖς as synon. of πλούσιοι) of the earth" stand those who by reason of misery and wretchedness go

down to the dust (עָפָר, in this formula always, like the Arabic *turâb*, referring to the dust of the grave). In the place of the participle יוֹרְדֵי there now commences with וְנַפְשׁוֹ (=וַאֲשֶׁר נַפְשׁוֹ) a clause with לֹא, which has the value of a relative clause (as in xlix. 21, lxxviii. 39, Prov. ix. 13 and freq.): and those who have not hitherto prolonged, could not prolong, their life (Ges., § 123, 3 *c*). Hupfeld takes it to refer, after the analogy of Phil. ii. 10, to those who are actually dead, so that what would be said would be that His kingdom extends to the living and the dead, to the upper and underworld; but thankful adoration of God on the part of the inhabitants of Hades is a notion that is foreign to the Old Testament and which nothing constrains us to admit here; for יוֹרְדֵי עָפָר means *descensuri* as well as *qui descenderunt*, and even in Ezek. xviii. 27, חִיָּה נַפְשׁוֹ means to preserve his own life, a phrase which admits of being used in the sense of *vitam sustentare* as well as in that of *conservare*. The meaning is therefore as follows: those who by reason of care and want are well nigh already dead, these also (and how thankfully precisely these) go down upon their knees, because they are esteemed worthy of being guests at this table. It is the same great feast of which Isa. xxv. 6 prophesies, and which he accompanies there with the music of his words. And what the gospel of the great deed of deliverance effects is not only of unlimited universality, but also of unlimited duration: it propagates itself from generation to generation. We formerly interpreted *v.* 31: "a seed, which shall serve Him, shall be counted unto the Lord for His generation," taking יְסֻפַּר as referring metaphorically to a census (2 Chron. ii. 16; cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 6), and לַדּוֹר, after the analogy of xxiv. 6 and other passages, as meaning a totality of one kind, just as זֶרַע means a totality of like origin. But in that case לְדוֹר must have been used, and the context makes it more natural to take דור in a genealogical sense. Accordingly we must abide by the usual interpretation: "a seed (offspring) shall

serve Him, it shall be told of the Lord to the (coming) generation." In connection with this interpretation it is natural to endeavour with Baethgen to get rid of the inconvenient לְדוֹר and to read לְדוֹר יבוֹא, just as the LXX. renders: *γενεὰ ἡ ἐρχομένη*. Still even in lxxi. 18 לְדוֹר stands by itself for the coming generation. According to the Masoretic text three generations are distinguished: that of the converted fathers in *v.* 30, that of the coming דוֹר in *v.* 31 and the עַם נוֹלָד in *v.* 32, to which the knowledge of salvation is transmitted by this דוֹר: "they shall come (בּוֹא as in lxxi. 18: come into being, not, as in Ruth ii. 7 and Hagg. i. 14, to set about a thing) and shall declare His righteousness to the people that shall be born, that He hath accomplished (it)." Accordingly זרע is the principal term, which falls into דור (יבאו) and עם נולד; the indeterminate expression "a seed" is to be understood after the analogy of בֵּר in ii. 12 (cf. בְּדוֹר, xcv. 10 and the more relevant זֶרַע in Isa. liii. 10). In our passage עם נולד is not *populus natus*, but *nasciturus* (Ges., § 134, 1); the rendering of the LXX. is excellent: *λαῷ τῷ τεχθησομένῳ* (cf. cii. 19, עַם נִבְרָא, *populus creandus*, and the other way of expressing the same idea in lxxviii. 6). צִדְקָתוֹ is the *δικαιοσύνη* of God that has been displayed in the deliverance of the great sufferer. That He did not allow him to come well nigh to the gates of death, without rescuing him from his murderous foes and raising him to so much the greater glory, this was divine צְדָקָה. That He did not rescue him from his murderous foes, without allowing him to come to the very brink of the grave—this wrathful side of the divine צְדָקָה is hinted at in 16 *c*, but as yet only in a very remote manner. For that the Servant of God, before spreading the *schelamim* feast, in which He makes the whole world participate in the fruit of His suffering, offers Himself as an *ascham*—it is not till somewhat later and under other typical situations that this becomes a subject of prophetic revelation. The purport of the עָשָׂה, its purport in conformity with the divine counsel,

is only gradually disclosed in the Old Testament. This one word, used here with the same fulness of meaning as in lii. 11, xxxvii. 5 and Isa. xliv. 23 to denote the carrying out of the work of redemption, a work which is exhibited prefiguratively in what had happened to David, comprehends everything within itself. It may be compared with the לַעֲשׂוֹת of Gen. ii. 3 at the close of the history of the work of creation. It is the last word of David as the persecuted by Saul, just as τετέλεσται is the last word of the crucified One. That God has accomplished what He proposed to Himself, when He anointed the son of Jesse and the Son of David to be the mediators of His work of salvation; that He has accomplished it by leading the former through suffering to the throne and by making the cross the ladder whereby the latter ascended to heaven: this is the purport of the preparatory gospel as well as that of the gospel in its fulfilment, the purport of the divine preclamation which is transmitted from generation to generation.

PSALM XXIII.

PRAISE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD.

1 Jahve is my Shepherd, I do not want.
2 In green pastures He maketh me lie down,
  By restful waters He gently leadeth me.
3 My soul He refresheth,
  He leadeth me in right tracks,—
  For His name's sake.

4 Though I walk in the valley of the shadow of death:
  I fear no evil, for Thou art with me,
  Thy rod and staff—they comfort me.
5 Thou preparest me a table in the presence of mine oppressors,
  Thou anointest my head with oil,
  My cup is fulness.

6 Only good-fortune and grace shall follow me
All the days of my life,
And I shall again dwell in the house of Jahve
For length of days.

There could not be a finer arrangement than that the Psalm, which speaks of a great feast of grace prepared for humanity, should now be followed by a Psalm, which praises Jahve as the shepherd and host of His own. If David is the author, as there is no reason to doubt, then this Psalm belongs to the time of Absalom's rebellion. It is the carrying out, as it were, of iv. 8; and iii. 7 also re-echoes in it. It coincides, however, not only with this couple of Psalms, which date from the time we have mentioned, but also with others that likewise belong to the same period, such as xxvii. 4, and more especially with lxiii., which purports to have been composed at the time when David had withdrawn along with his faithful followers over the Kedron and the Mount of Olives into the solitudes of the wilderness of Judah, whither Hushai sent him the intelligence that determined him to cross the Jordan as speedily as possible. It is characteristic of all these Psalms, that in them David yearns after the house of God as his real home, and that all his longings concentrate in the desire to be once more at home in this house, to which he clings with the love of his whole heart. And does not this short, vernal, fervent and tender hymn accord with David's life of want and of wandering to and fro at that time? It consists of two hexastichs with short closing lines, resembling (so also Isa. xvi. 9, 10) the Adonic verse of the Sapphic strophe, and a tetrastich which is made up of very short and somewhat longer lines.

Vers. 1–3. The poet calls Jahve רֹעִי, as being the one who in the same gracious way ever provides for and guides him and all that are His. Later prophecy announces the visible Parousia of this Shepherd (Isa. xl. 11, Ezek. xxxiv. 37 and freq.). When it has taken place, the יְהוָה רֹעִי from human lips

finds the cordial echo: ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. He who has Jahve, the possessor of all things, has everything; he does not lack, viz. כָּל־טוֹב, whatever is good in itself and would be good for him (xxxiv. 11, lxxxiv. 12). There is no need, however, to supply any such expression; here, as in Neh. ix. 21, Prov. xiii. 25 (cf. אִישׁ מַחְסוֹר), חָסַר includes famishing and suffering from want of every kind. נְאוֹת דֶּשֶׁא are pasture-grounds of fresh, tender, soft grass, where one lies at ease, and rest and enjoyment are combined; according to its primary meaning, נָאָה (נָוָה) is a place of settlement as the end of one's wandering, Arab. نَوًى (*vid.* Hupfeld), and then in general a resting place, a place where one tarries or dwells, more especially an oasis, *i.e.* the meadow-land of the desert. רָבַץ, cog. רָבַע (whence the Hebrew term for "four") means to lie down, to encamp, as we say, "to stretch out all fours." מֵי מְנוּחוֹת are waters, where one finds the most agreeable resting-place (according to Hitzig the plural, מנוחת, is owing to the plural of the governing word, מֵי; at any rate it is a superlative plural) and can at the same time refresh one's self. נָהַל is suited to this, as being a pastoral word used of leading gently and more especially of guiding the flocks and herds to the watering place (cf. ὁδηγεῖν, Apoc. vii. 17), just as הִרְבִּיץ is used of making them lie down to rest, especially at noon (Cant. i. 7).[1] שׁוֹבֵב נַפְשִׁי (elsewhere הֵשִׁיב) means to bring the soul back again to itself, to bring the soul that has become unlike itself once more into a condition of equilibrium (cf. أَنِسَ, iv., to tranquillize), and therefore to inspire with new life, *recreare*. He does

[1] In Assyrian *na'âlu* (נאל) means to lie (to encamp) as a synonym of *rabâṣu* (רבץ); but in the case of the Heb. נָהַל (הִתְנַהֵל) we cannot bring out the meaning "to lower, to set down" (synon. הניח) in the manner attempted by Lotz, *Inscriften Tiglathpilesers*, i. pp. 122*f.* If the idea of rest is really connected with the root נה (נא) as it is with נח, then נָהַל means to lead peacefully, gently, pleasantly.

this to the soul, by causing it amidst the dryness and heat of temptation and trouble to taste the powers of life which refresh and strengthen it. As in cxliii. 10, the *Hiph.* הִנְחָה is the intensive of נָחָה (lxxvii. 21), Arab. نحى, *dirigere*, to move in a definite direction, to direct; the poet boasts that Jahve leads him carefully, without risk and danger of going astray, בְּמַעְגְּלֵי־צֶדֶק,[1] in tracks that are straight, and which lead to the right goal, and that too לְמַעַן שְׁמוֹ. He has revealed Himself as the gracious One, and as such He will prove and glorify Himself even in connection with the need of him who yields himself to His guidance.

Vers. 4, 5. Rod and staff are here not by any means those of the pilgrim, which would be a misleading sudden transition to a different figure, but those of Jahve the shepherd (שֵׁבֶט as in Mic. vii. 14, and along with it, cf. Num. xxi. 18, מִשְׁעֶנֶת, to make the figure more picturesque) as the means of guidance and defence. The one rod, by holding up which the shepherd guides the flock, and supporting himself upon which he carefully watches it, has assumed a double form in the picture presented to the Psalmist's mind: this rod and staff in God's hand comfort him, *i.e.* impart to him the feeling of security and therefore make him of good cheer. Even when he walks (גַּם כִּי, *etiamsi*, always with the *impf.*; cf. on the other hand *etiam quum*, with the *perf.*, Jos. xxii. 7) through a narrow defile, dark and gloomy as the grave, where surprise and disasters of every kind threaten him, he fears no misfortune. The LXX. detracts from the force of the figure by translating בגיא, after the Aramaic בְּגוֹא (Dan. iii. 25), with ἐν μέσῳ. The noun צלמות, which occurs here for the first time in the Old Testament literature, is not originally a compound word, but, like the Assyrian *ṣalmu* (darkness, gloom), is formed from a verb צלם (ظلم, *opprimere*, which is

[1] On the dagesch in the first of the two labials בְּמ, *vid.* Baer on this passage, and König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 62*f.*

used both of despotic oppression and of oppressive, veiling darkness) after the analogy of the form עַבְדוּת, although pronounced צַלְמָוֶת (cf. חַצַרְמָוֶת, *Ḥaṣramôt* = court of death, בְּצַלְאֵל, in-God's-shadow); it means "shadow of death" as a designation of the most fearful darkness (*e.g.* that of Hades, Job x. 21 *f.*; but also that of the shaft of a mine, Job xxviii. 3), and more especially of darkness, such as makes itself felt in an uninhabited wild desert (Jer. ii. 6). Now that in *v.* 4 the figure of the shepherd has faded away, that of the host makes its appearance. His enemies must look on (נֶגֶד as in xxxi. 20), without being able to offer any opposition, and see how sumptuously Jahve provides for His guest, how He anoints him with sweet perfumes as at a joyous, magnificent feast (xcii. 11) and fills his cup even to overflowing. What is meant thereby is not necessarily merely purely spiritual blessings: the king, a fugitive before Absalom and forsaken by the mass of his people, was also outwardly in danger of perishing along with his army from want; there is, therefore, also meant such a superabundance of daily bread as poured in upon them according to 2 Sam. xvii. 27–29; but even this is regarded spiritually and thought of as a heavenly gift; the satisfying and refreshing and quickening that he had experienced in connection with his physical life are only the outward aspects of a simultaneous inward experience. In accordance with the tendency to revert to the perfect as the ground-form of the verb, the impf. תַּעֲרֹךְ is followed by דִּשַּׁנְתָּ, which is likewise meant to be understood as a present. And in the statement with which the strophe closes כּוֹסִי, my cup, is metonymically equivalent to the contents of my cup. These are רְוָיָה, fulness satiating even to excess.

Ver. 6. Foes are at present pursuing him; but pure good fortune and grace shall follow him and therefore beat his present pursuers from the field. אַךְ, originally affirmative, here however restrictive, belongs in its signification *nil nisi* (xxxix. 6, 12, cxxxix. 11) to the subject. The LXX., Symm.,

Quinta, Syr., and the Vulgate take טוב אך רויה together, misled by the circumstance that טוב וחסד are nowhere else coupled together. There is no other instance of the occurrence of this expression: Jahve will send forth טוב and חֶסֶד as good spirits, to overtake David's enemies, and to protect him against them to their shame, and that too all his life long (accusative of duration). Seeing that we refer the Psalm to the time when he was persecuted by Absalom, we neither require to persuade ourselves that וְשַׁבְתִּי is equivalent to וְשָׁבְתִּי in xxvii. 4 (LXX., Symm., Jer.), nor that it is equivalent to וְיָשַׁבְתִּי. The infinitive is logically inadmissible here, and with the vowel *ă* instead of *i*, which would be here (cf. on the other hand קָהָתִי) confusing arbitrariness, unheard of. Nor is it probable that it is contracted from וישבתי; the aphæresis may be admissible in the case of the *infin. absol.*, where the finite verb that supports it prevents all ambiguity (Jer. xlii. 10: שׁוֹב = יָשׁוֹב), and, after the analogy of שָׁבָת, in the case of שִׁיבָה = יָשִׁיבָה (2 Sam. xix. 33); here, however, it would be without any adequate reason or design, and in 1 Sam. xii. 2, the LXX. (*καὶ καθήσομαι*) has imported into the וּשְׁבתי a meaning which only וישבתי can have. In our passage we have rather before us a *constr. prægnans:* "and I shall return (*perf. consec.*) in the house of Jahve" *i.e.* having returned, I shall again dwell in the house of Jahve. Even by itself וְשַׁבְתִּי בְ might mean *et revertam ad* (cf. vii. 17; Hos. xii. 7), just as עָלָה בְ (xxiv. 3) means *adscendere ad* (*in*). But the appended assertion of duration which is added, לְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים (as in xciii. 5, Lam. v. 20: אֹרֶךְ, √רך, extension = length), exactly like the Assyr. *ana arkat ûmê*, favours the explanation, that בְ is to be connected in thought with the וישבתי which is implied as a natural consequence in וּשְׁבתי.

PSALM XXIV.

PREPARATION FOR THE RECEPTION OF THE LORD WHO IS NEAR AT HAND.

A. *The Psalm sung while the procession is going up (below on the hill of Zion).*

Chorus of the festive procession.

1 The earth is Jahve's and the fulness thereof,
The world and they that dwell therein.
2 For He, He hath founded it upon the seas,
And upon the floods did He establish it.

A voice.

3 Who may ascend the mountain of Jahve,
And who may stand in His holy place?

Another voice.

4 He that is of guiltless hands and of pure heart,
That doth not lift up his soul to vanity
And doth not swear deceitfully—

Chorus.

5 He shall receive a blessing from Jahve
And righteousness from the God of His salvation.
6 This is the generation of them that inquire after Him,
That seek Thy face—— Jacob (*Selah*).

B. *The Psalm sung while entering (above, before the citadel of Zion).*

Chorus of the festive procession.

7 Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
Yea lift yourselves up, ye ancient doors,
That the King of glory may enter in!

A voice as it were from the gates.

8 Who then is the King of glory?

Chorus.

Jahve, a mighty one and a hero,
Jahve, a hero in battle.
9 Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
Yea lift yourselves up, ye ancient doors,
That the King of glory may enter in!

As it were from the gates.

10 Who is He, then, the King of glory?

Chorus.

Jahve of hosts,
He is the King of glory (*Selah*).

Ps. xxiii. expressed a longing after the house of Jahve on Zion; Ps. xxiv., composed when the ark of the covenant was brought from Kirjath-Jearim to Mount Zion, where David caused it to be placed in a tent pitched expressly for it (2 Sam. vi. 17; cf. xi. 11, 1 Kings i. 39), celebrates Jahve's entrance into Zion and the true character of him who enters along with Him. On account of the designation of the hill as הַר ה׳ and the description of Jahve as a hero in battle, one would perhaps be rather inclined to date it from a time when the ark, after having been taken along with the army to the war (*vid.* Ps. lxviii.), had been brought back to Mount Zion; but the first half of the Psalm (*vv.* 1–6) does not fit in with this conjecture. This portion of the Psalm is similar to Ps. xv. and is in no respect wanting in complete independence. Accordingly Ewald divides Ps. xxiv. into two hymns that belong to different times, although both are old Davidic: the festive hymn (xxiv. 7–10) which was sung when the ark was transferred to Zion, and a purely didactic hymn (xxiv. 1–6) which presupposes this epoch-making event. And in reality it is comparatively more natural in the case of this Psalm than in the case of Ps. xix. to regard it as two hymns combined so as to form one; and if it were to be broken up in this fashion, there would be no more suitable occasion and situation for the second half, than the bringing back of the ark to the sanctuary after a victorious war. But the martial tone of the second half can be explained, even if the Psalm owes its origin to the event mentioned in 2 Sam. vi. 15; for the battles with the Jebusites, by means of which David had taken possession of the citadel of Zion (2 Sam. v. 7), which

was afterwards named the city of David, were still fresh in their memory. To the title, לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר, the LXX. adds τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου (σαββάτων), *i.e.* של אחד בשבת (for the first day of the week), according to which this Psalm was the customary Psalm for Sunday. This addition is confirmed by the Talmudic statements in *Thamid*, vii. 4, *Rosch ha-Schana*, 31 *a*, *Sofrim*, c. 18 (cf. *supra*, p. 42). In the second of the passages cited from the Talmud, R. Akiba seeks to determine the reasons for this choice by referring to the history of the work of creation.

Adopted into Israel's hymn-book, the original occasion and purpose of this Psalm were ignored, and it became an Old Testament advent hymn in honour of the Lord who should come to His temple (Mal. iii. 1); and the cry: "lift up your heads, O ye gates" acquired essentially the same meaning as the voice of the herald in Isa. xl. 3; "prepare ye Jahve's way, make level in the desert a high-way for our God." In the New Testament consciousness, the place of the first Parousia is taken by the second, the coming of the Lord of glory to His Church, which is His spiritual temple, and which is called upon in this Psalm to prepare a worthy reception for Him. The explanation of the second half of the Psalm, which makes it refer to the entrance of the conqueror of death into Hades (an interpretation which is based upon the Gospel of Nicodemus, and which is still current in the Greek Church), as well as the patristic explanation of it as referring to the εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψις τοῦ κυρίου offend against the laws of exegesis as much as against the parallelism of the Old and New Testament facts.

Vers. 1–6. Jahve, whose gracious throne is now established upon Zion, has not, like the gods of the heathen, a limited domain: His right of sovereignty embraces the earth and its fulness (primary passages: Ex. xix. 5, Deut. xxxiii. 16), *i.e.* everything that is to be found upon it and in it (Deut. x. 14), the world, תֵּבֵל (*i.e.* the οἰκουμένη, *vid.* on ix.

9), and they that dwell therein (thereupon).[1] For He, הוּא, is the owner of the world, because its creator. He has founded it upon seas, *i.e.* the ocean and its floods, נְהָרוֹת ῥέεθρα (Jon. ii. 4); for the waters were, before the dry land was created, and the latter emerged from them at God's omnipotent word; so that consequently the dry land which rises above the surface of the sea, and which indeed also conceals תְּהוֹם רַבָּה in its interior (Gen. vii. 11), has waters as it were for its basis (cxxxvi. 6), although it would rather sink down into them than maintain itself above them, if it were not supported within itself by God's creative power. Hereupon arises the question: who may ascend the mountain of Jahve and stand above in His holy place? Here as compared with Lev. x. 17 the term מְקוֹם הַקֹּדֶשׁ is used in a more general and ethical sense. The imperfects have a potential signification: who can do it with confidence, how, therefore, must he be constituted, whom Jahve receives into His fellowship and with whose worship He is well-pleased? Answer: he must be one who is guiltless in his walk and pure in heart, one who does not lift up his soul לַשָּׁוְא? (according to the Masora with *Waw minusculum*). שָׁוְא (= שָׁוְא from שׁוֹא) is that which is waste, void and (seeing that the divine is that which really and truly exists) ungodly and anti-divine; and נָשָׂא נַפְשׁ לְ (אֶל) means to direct one's soul (xxv. 1) or one's longing and striving towards something (Deut. xxiv. 15; Prov. xix. 18, Hos. iv. 8). The *Kerî*, נַפְשִׁי, is old.[2] Even

[1] In 1 Cor. x. 26, Paul grounds upon Ps. xxiv. 1 (cf. l. 12) his doctrine that (apart from a charitable regard to the weak) a Christian may eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without troubling himself as to whether it has been in the temple of the idols or no. A Talmudic teacher in *Berachoth* 35 *a* deduces from this verse the duty of saying grace before meals: whoever eats without giving thanks is like one who lays hands on קדשׁי שׁמים; it is prayer that first justifies one in partaking of food.

[2] The reading נַפְשִׁי is adopted by Saadia (in *Eumunoth*, c. ii, where נפשׁי = נשׁמי), Juda ha-Levi (*Cuzari*, iii. 27), Abulwalid (*Rikma*, p. 180), Raschi, Kimchi, Sohar, several Codices (and among them that of 1294)

the LXX. (*Cod. Alex.*) translates: τὴν ψυχήν μου, whereas Codd. Vat. and Sin. (Eus., Apollin., Theodor., etc.) have τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. But this *Kerî* is exegetically incomprehensible, unless נַפְשִׁי were equivalent to שְׁמִי (Ex. xx. 7); but even from Amos vi. 8 and Jer. li. 14 this does not seem possible. That the poet should have so written, is incredible. In *v.* 5 it is said (just as at the close of Ps. xv.) in continued predicates, that such an one is the man of worth, after whom *v.* 3 enquired. Such an one יִשָּׂא בְרָכָה, shall receive (נשׂא as in Deut. xxxiii. 3) or obtain (Esth. ii. 17) a blessing from Jahve and righteousness from the God of his salvation (xxv. 5, xxvii. 9). Righteousness, *i.e.* conformity to God and acceptableness in God's sight, appears here as a gift, in which sense it is synonymous with יְשׁוּעָה (*e.g.* cxxxii. 9, 16); it is the righteousness of God, after which even the righteous (not, however, the self-righteous) hungers and thirsts (Matt. v. 6; cf. Prov. xxi. 21), that ethical perfection, which is the restoration and at the same time also the working out by one's self of the image of God: transformation into the image of the Holy One Himself. With *v.* 5 the question put in *v.* 3 is answered; *v.* 6 adds that those whose character is such and who may therefore expect God's gift of salvation, are the true community of Jahve, the Israel of God, the Jacob that answers to His idea. דּוֹר (properly revolution, Arab. *dahr*, √דר, to revolve, move in a circle), used here, as

and most editions (among which the Complutensian has נפשי in the text). Nor does Aben Ezra, whom Norzi has misunderstood, by any means reverse the meaning of *Chethîb* and *Kerî*; he regards נַפְשִׁי as *Keri* and explains it as a metaphor (an anthropomorphism): וכתוב נפשי דרך כנוי. Only Elias Levita (in c. 9 of his *Masoreth ha-masoreth*) rejects the *Keri*, נפשי, and demands for נַפְשִׁי a so-called וי"ו קטיעא (*Vav abscissum*) as in שְׁלוֹם in Num. xxv. 12. He is the only critic of the text who rejects this *Keri*, considering it to have arisen from some misunderstanding. For Jacob b. Chajim is only surprised (and rightly) that נַפְשִׁי is not found in the Masoretic register of words that are written with *Vav* and to be read with *Jod*. Cf. Baer's editions of the Psalter published by Brockhaus (1874) and Tauchnitz (1880).

in xiv. 5, lxxiii. 15, cxii. 2 (cf. γενεά, Matt. xvii. 17 and freq.), of a totality bound together not by contemporaneousness, but by similarity of disposition, alliterates with the following דֹּרְשָׁיו (*Chethib* דרשו without *Jod plur.*); מְבַקְשֵׁי פָנֶיךָ (cf. xxvii. 8) is a second genitive depending on דּוֹר. Here at the close the predication passes over into invocation. And יַעֲקֹב is a summarising predicate: in short, these are Jacob, not merely after the flesh, but after the spirit, and therefore in truth (Isa. xliv. 2; cf. Rom. ix. 6, Gal. vi. 16). The insertion of אלהי with the LXX., Vulg., and Pesch. (Ew., Olsh., Hupf., Böttch., Riehm) makes it easier for us to understand this יעקב; but all the other ancient versions (so also Luther and Jerome) rightly decline the assistance of this interpolation. The predicate, which has assumed several forms, concentrates itself in the one word יעקב, which it has all along had in view. And here the music swells in volume; the first part of the double Psalm dies away in the playing of the instruments of the Levitical priests; for the ark of the covenant was brought in בְּכָל-עֹז וּבְשִׁירִים, as 2 Sam. vi. 5 (cf. *v.* 14) ought to be read.

Vers. 7–10 The festal procession has now arrived at the gates of the citadel of Zion. These are called פִּתְחֵי עוֹלָם, doors of eternity (not of "the world," as Luther contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament translates it), either as being doors for which pious faith hopes an eternal duration (LXX. αἰώνιοι, Vulg. *æternales*, Jer. *sempiternæ*), as Hupfeld and Hitzig explain it, understanding thereby, but contrary to the title of the Psalm, the gates of the Salomonic temple, or (and we think this far more appropriate in the mouth of those who are standing before them) as being the portals that reach back into the dim past (עוֹלָם as *e.g.* in Gen. xlix. 26, Isa. lviii. 12), the time of the Jebusites, yea even of Melchizedek, and through which the king, whose whole being and doing is glory, is now to enter. It is the gates of the citadel of Zion, to which the cry is addressed, to

expand themselves conformably with the dignity of the lord who is entering in and for whom they are too mean and diminutive. Rejoicing in the great honour, of which they are deemed worthy, they are to raise their heads (Job x. 15, Zech. ii. 4), *i.e.* lift up their lintels; the ancient doors are to open themselves high and wide.[1] Then from the gates of Zion, which are wont to allow only great lords to enter, there echoes back to the festal procession the question, "who then (זֶה, to give animation to the question, Ges., § 122, 2) is this glorious king"? and they describe Him more particularly: it is the heroic God, by means of whom Israel has wrested this Zion from the Jebusites with the sword, and by means of whom it has hitherto always proved victorious. The adjectival intensive form עִזּוּז (like לְמוּד a secondary form of חַנּוּן, קִשּׁוּב) occurs elsewhere only in Isa. xliii. 17; גִּבּוֹר מִלְחָמָה refers back to Ex. xv. 3, just as the designation of Jahve as a king goes back upon the fundamental theocratical confession in Ex. xv. 18. The gates are therefore to lift their heads and the ancient doors to lift themselves up, *i.e.* open high and wide; in this instance the summons to the doors is expressed with *Kal* instead of *Niph.* (נִשָּׂא, to raise one's self up, as in Nah. i. 5, Hos. xiii. 1, Hab i. 3), in accordance with the well known custom for refrains and refrain-like repetitions to move on smoothly and gently. The gates of Zion again put their question; no longer, however, hesitatingly, but in order once more to hear the praise of the great King. It is now a question arising from a desire for further information; the heaping up of the pronouns (as in Jer. xxx. 21; cf. xlvi. 7, Esth. vii. 1) makes it urgent (*quis tandem, ecquisnam*). The answer runs: "Jahve Zebaoth, He is the King of glory (now making His entry)." יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is the proper title which was usually given to Jahve as King during the

[1] On the *Munach* instead of *Metheg* in וְהִנָּשְׂאוּ *vid.* Baer's *Accentsystem*, vii. 2.

period of the kings in Israel. צְבָאוֹת is a genitive governed by יְ and in every other connection means human *exercitus*; for this reason Baur assumes with Herder that this divine name was originally used as a designation of the God who helped His own people in battle, and that it was not till a later period that צְבָאוֹת was made to refer to the heavenly hosts, and still later to the totality of creatures. The translations Κύριος στρατιῶν (Aq., Symm., Theod.), Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων (LXX. in the Pss.) and Κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ (LXX. *e.g.* in Nah. iii. 5) would exhibit these three stages in the apprehension of this term. But if the first of these three ways of apprehending it were the original one, it would be incomprehensible why this divine name should be avoided in the Pentateuch, in Joshua and in Judges, and should, on the other hand, be made the signature of the time of the kings, (cf. on the other hand Ex. vii. 4, xii. 41 and freq.). That, however, which is characteristic of the time of the kings is the war of Jahve's people with the peoples round about, whose religion consists in the deification of the heavenly bodies, and more especially with the Aramæans. Accordingly it is natural to assume that, when it occurs in this divine name, צבאות has the reference to angels and stars (which are called צְבָאָיו in ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2), the way for which was prepared by such experiences and utterances as we find in Gen. xxxii. 2*f.*, Deut. xxxiii. 2, Judg. v. 20: Jahve's hosts consist of celestial heroes (Joel iv. 11) and of the stars that march forth upon the plain of heaven as if in battle array (Isa. xl. 26). צָבָא = صبأ, to go forth, said of a tooth which is beginning to cut and of a rising star.[1] It is therefore the ruler who commands the heavenly hosts that desires admission. The gates are silent and open, and Jahve, enthroned above the cherubim of the sacred ark, enters Zion.

[1] *Vid.* my article: *Der Gottesname Jahve Zebaoth* in the *Luth. Zeitschrift* for 1874, pp. 217–222.

PSALM XXV.

A PRAYER FOR GRACIOUS PROTECTION AND GUIDANCE.

1 א Unto Thee, Jahve, do I lift up my soul.
2 ב My God, in Thee do I trust, I shall not be shamed,
My foes shall not triumph over me.
3 ג Yea, none that wait for Thee shall be shamed,
They shall be shamed, who are faithless without cause.
4 ד Thy ways, Jahve, make me to know,
Thy paths teach me.
5 ה Lead me in Thy truth and teach me,
For Thou art the God of my salvation;
In Thee do I hope continually.
6 ו Remember, Jahve, Thy tender mercies and Thy compassions,
For they are from of old.
7 ח Remember not the sins of my youth and transgressions;
According to Thy mercy think on me
For Thy goodness' sake, Jahve!
8 ט Good and upright is Jahve,
Therefore instructeth He sinners in the right way.
9 י In that which is right leadeth He the meek,
And He teacheth the meek His way.
10 כ All the paths of Jahve are grace and truth
To such as keep His covenant and His testimonies.
11 ל Jahve, for Thy name's sake pardon mine iniquity,
For it is great.
12 מ Who, then, is the man that feareth Jahve?
Him will He teach in the way he ought to choose.
13 נ His soul shall dwell in prosperity,
And his seed shall inherit the land.
14 ס Jahve communicateth His secret to them that fear Him,
And His covenant doth He make them know.
15 ע Mine eyes are ever towards Jahve,
For He will pull my feet out of the net.
16 פ Turn unto me and be gracious unto me,
For I am lonely and miserable.
17 צ Troubles have spread over my heart,
Out of my distresses bring Thou me!
18 ר Look upon mine affliction, and my travail,
And forgive all my sins.

19 ר Look upon mine enemies, for they are many,
And with cruel hatred do they hate me.
20 ש Preserve my soul and deliver me,
Let me not be shamed, for I hide myself in Thee.
21 ת Let integrity and uprightness protect me,
For I hope in Thee.
22 פ Redeem Israel, Elohim,
Out of all his troubles.

A question similar to the one in Ps. xxiv., *Who may ascend the hill of Jahve?* is put in Ps. xxv., *Who is the man that feareth Jahve?* in order to answer it with great and beautiful promises. It is a calmly confident prayer for help against enemies, and for the instructing, pardoning, and guiding grace of God, without any distinct historical background indicative of its date, and without any clearly marked traits of individuality. It is one of the nine alphabetical Psalms in the whole collection, the companion piece to Ps. xxxiv., with which it corresponds in many of the peculiarities of its acrostic structure; for neither of them has a ו-strophe, at the beginning of the כ, ע, and פ-i. strophes they run parallel both in sound and sense, and, after having gone through the alphabet, they both have a concluding strophe, beginning with פ-ii., whose commencement and contents are nearly akin. These similarities point to one author, David, for we see nothing in the alphabetical arrangement of the Psalm to prevent us from holding this opinion, an arrangement, which here also, as in Pss. ix.–x., is freely dealt with, and is not quite completely carried out. But owing to the nature of its general ethical and religious contents any positive proof of this opinion is lacking. It is a Psalm in the Maschal style. The lyric here shows the influence of the Chokma literature, but it contains nothing which is not in harmony with the believing consciousness of the Church of all ages,—nothing specifically distinctive of the Old Testament or of Israel; and hence Theodoret says:—ἁρμόζει μάλιστα τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν κεκλημένοις. The introits for the second

and third Sundays in Quadragesima are taken from verses 6 and 15, and on this account these Sundays are called *Reminiscere* and *Oculi*. Paul Gerhardt's "*Nach dir, O Herr, verlanget mich*" is a beautiful paraphrase of this Psalm.

Vers. 1, 2. Like Pss. xvi. and xxiii., it begins with a monostich; *v.* 2 is the ב-strophe, as אֱלֹהַי (unless one is disposed to read בְּךָ אֱלֹהַי, following the order of words in xxxi. 2), after the manner of interjections in the tragedians, *e.g.* ὤμοι, is not to be regarded as part of the verse (J. D. Köhler). In need of help, and full of yearnings after salvation, he lifts his soul, withdrawn from all earthly desires, to Jahve (lxxxvi. 4, cxliii. 8), the God who alone can bestow what really satisfies;[1] his ego, which sustains the soul, directs it up to Him, whom with the confidence of faith he calls אֱלֹהַי. The אַל, twice over, is, as in xxxi. 2, 18, the denial of what seems to faith to be impossible. לִי is to be connected with יַעֲלְצוּ, after the analogy of xxxv. 19, 24, xxxviii. 17 (cf. lxxi. 10); so also xxvii. 2, xxx. 2, Mic. vii. 8. To connect it with אוֹיְבַי makes a pleonasm, which is not to be excused by cxliv. 2. The confident expectation of the individual is generalised in *v.* 3.

Ver. 3. What the petitioner comforts himself with is no special prerogative of his, but what all believers as well (גַּם) may expect of God: ἡ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει, Rom. v. 5. Believers are called קַוֶּיךָ (קָוָה *part.* to קָוָה, earnestly to expect, to long for, to hope for, just as דֹּבֵר *part.* to דָּבַר); hope is the eye of faith looking clear and unmoved into the future. To those who hope in Jahve, who never can be disappointed in Him, are contrasted the בּוֹגְדִים (from בָּגַד *tegere*, then *tecte* = *subdole agere*), those who deal faithlessly with Him (cxix. 158, Aq., Symm., Theod., οἱ ἀποστατοῦντες); and that

[1] According to *Pesikta*, 87*a*, אִשָּׁה, to Thee I bend (אֶשָּׂא) my soul, would be the original reading. Aq. actually translates παραπίπτω ψυχήν μου, Symm. προσπίπτω τὴν ψυχήν μου.

too רֵיקָם, *i.e.* as it can be nothing else, wantonly deluding themselves by baseless pretexts.

Ver. 4. Acknowledging the shamefulness of such black ingratitude, he pleads for instruction as to the way in which, according to God's direction, he is to go (xviii. 22). God's will, no doubt, lies before us in His written word, but for the right understanding of it God is Himself the needful interpreter. He asks for full knowledge; but that he may translate it into a full living actuality, he needs God again; he needs, in other words, both His enlightening and also His guiding grace.

Ver. 5. His truth is the abiding and self-evidencing fact of His revelation of grace. To penetrate into that truth, and to walk in it, without God (xxvi. 3, lxxxvi. 11), is self-contradictory. And hence the poet pleads, as in cxix. 35, ὁδήγησόν με ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου (Symm., Aq., on the other hand LXX. ἐπὶ τὴν . . ., cf. John xvi. 13). This he pleads, for his salvation comes from Jahve, yea, Jahve is Himself his salvation: he does not hope for this or that, but he hopes in Him all the day, *i.e.* unceasingly,[1] for all that is worth hoping for, all that satisfies longing, is included in Him. But all grace, coming from Him, has its root in His compassion and condescension.

Ver. 6. The supplicatory *reminiscere* means, that God would now and never forget to exercise His compassions and His grace towards him, which (as the plurals tell us) are so rich and exceeding abundant. The ground on which the prayer rests is given by כִּי (*nam* or even *quoniam*): God's compassions and mercy are as old in their operation as man's weakness and sin, in their purposes they are eternal, and

[1] Hupf. thinks the accentuation unsuitable, but the first half of the verse extends really to יְשָׁעִי, and consists of two parts, the second of which assigns the reason for the first part; the second half of the verse contains a comparatively new thought. The sequence of the accents: *Rebia magnum*, *Athnach*, is quite appropriate.

therefore they have in themselves the guarantee also of everlasting duration (c. 5, ciii. 17).

Ver. 7. May God not think of the faults of his youth (חַטֹּאוֹת), into which he had been drawn by fleshly lusts and thoughtlessness, or of his transgressions (פְּשָׁעִים), by which, even in riper and more thoughtful years, he had turned the grace of God into lasciviousness, and broken away from fellowship with God (בָּ פָּשַׁע used of apostasy); rather may He think of him according to His grace, to which, as being the method of self-manifestation best corresponding with God's nature, אַתָּה appeals. The verb זָכַר, when meaning to think of one, is also elsewhere construed with the dative of the object, cxxxvi. 23, Ex. xxxii. 13 and freq.; Böttcher's conjecture of אֹתָהּ is therefore superfluous. "*Memor esto quidem mei*," remarks Augustin, "*non secundum iram, qua ego dignus sum, sed secundum misericordiam tuam, quæ te digna est.*" For God is טוֹב, an expression which is, substantially, equivalent to He is ἀγάπη. The distich following shows that טוּב does not here refer, as *e.g.* in Neh. ix. 35, to God's fulness of blessing, but to His goodness.

Ver. 8. The בְּ with הוֹרָה (literally to throw out, *i.e.* the arm and hand with a view to point out) denotes, as in xxxii. 8, Prov. iv. 11, Job xxvii. 11, the way, *i.e.* the right way (Job xxxi. 7), as the sphere and object (xxvii. 11) of the instruction. God condescends to sinners, to teach them to walk in the way that leads to life, for He is טוֹב־וְיָשָׁר, *i.e.* He is gracious and means good without reserve and without exception, unless our conduct requires Him to act differently towards us (xviii. 27*b*).

Ver. 9. The shortened form of the imperfect stands here, as often in the poetic style, instead of the full form (for the context leads us to expect facts not wishes); it is therefore quite arbitrary to punctuate יַדְרֵךְ.[1] The בּ (cf. *v.* 5, cvii. 7,

[1] Driver, in the second edition of his Treatise on the Hebrew Tenses (1881), decides ultimately that whenever the jussive form occurs with an

cxix. 35) indicates the sphere of guidance; מִשְׁפָּט is the right so far as it is traversed, *i.e.* practised. In this way of right He leads the עֲנָוִים, and teaches them the way which is well-pleasing to Him. They are designated by one word, which means both the meek, *mansueti*, and the humble, *modesti*. Jerome varies his translation in 9*a* and 9*b* by using these Latin words, but the Psalmist intentionally repeats the same term referring to the cardinal virtue of עֲנָוָה, here with the preponderating idea of humility. On the self-righteous and the self-satisfied He would have to force Himself even against their will. He desires scholars who are eager to be taught; and how does He reward those, who keep what they have learnt!

Ver. 10. The paths meant are those in which, in conformity with His revelation, will and purpose, He walks with men. These paths are חֶסֶד, for the salvation of men is their goal, and אֱמֶת, for at every step they confirm the trustworthiness of His promises. But only those who faithfully and obediently keep His covenant and His testimonies, are made partakers in His grace. To the Psalmist the name of Jahve, which unfolds itself in grace and truth, is dear. On it he bases the prayer which follows.

Ver. 11. To the יְהִי, which according to the sense is implied in לְמַעַן שִׁמְךָ, the *perf. consec.* is attached, just as elsewhere also it comes after adverbial clauses, put first for emphasis, if these clauses point to the future (Ges., § 126,

indicative signification, without being objectionable on grounds of textual criticism, there is a shortening of the mood of sequence by the rejection of the ו *consecutive*. Accordingly יִדְרֹךְ in our passage, if the poet so expressed himself, would be equivalent to וַיִּדְרֹךְ. I doubt if this opinion can be made good, and I rather agree with William Turner, in his discussion on the Hebrew tenses (in *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, 1876), that the jussive, like the cohortative, although essentially an intensive expression of an inner impulse, may also be used with a weakened emphasis, so as to give a lively colouring to the words. In the poetic style the jussive form serves as it were as a winged expression of the future (lxxii. 13), or of the present (lviii. 5), or even of the past (xviii. 12).

remark 1). Individual and manifold sins (*v.* 7) are comprehended under עָוֹן, a word which elsewhere also is the collective term for the corruption and the guilt of sin. The necessity and urgency of the prayer for forgiveness (סָלַח, literally to remove) are accounted for by כִּי. A load of great and various sins lies on him, but the name of God, *i.e.* His nature, revealed in grace and truth, authorises him to ask for and to hope for forgiveness, not on account of any deed of his, but just for His name's sake (Jer. xiv. 7, Isa. xliii. 25). How happy, therefore, in this respect, is he who fears God!

Ver. 12. The question: *quisnam est vir*, resembling xxxiv. 13, cvii. 43, Isa. l. 10, is put merely in order to draw attention to him who has such qualifications, and then to say what such an one has to expect: in prose we should have a relative antecedent clause instead: *qui* (*quisquis*) *talis est qui Dominum vereatur*. The attributive יִבְחָר (*viam*) *quam eligat* (comp. Isa. xlviii. 17) may be also referred to God: in him He takes delight (LXX.), but parallel passages like cxix. 30, 173 favour the rendering *eligendam*. Among all the blessings of him who fears God, this is to be put first, that God lifts him above vacillation on account of human opinion.

Ver. 13. The verb לִין (לוּן) signifies to stay over night, to lodge;[1] good, *i.e.* inward and outward prosperity, is like the place of resort and protection for such an one. And what was promised to the patriarchs and to the people when they were delivered from Egypt, will be fulfilled to his posterity: the possession of the land, or, as this promise is expressed in the New Testament, of the earth, Matt. v. 5 (comp. Ps. xxxvii. 11), Rev. v. 10.

Ver. 14. The LXX. translates סוֹד *κραταίωμα*, but יְסוֹד and the סוֹד derived therefrom *per aphæresin* are sharply distin-

[1] *Lânu* means in Assyrian an enclosing wall, the court (of a house), from which a denominative, לוּן, may be formed in the same way as בּוּת from בַּיִת.

guished by the usage of the language. The reciprocal נוֹסַד, ii. 2 (which see), points to the primary meaning. Starting from the primary meaning of √סד, סוֹד signifies the being pressed closely together with a view to secret communication and converse, confidential communion (lix. 8, cxi. 1, Symm. *ὁμιλία*, LXX. Prov. xv. 22 *συνέδριον*, Theod. *συμβούλιον*), then the confidential communication itself, lv. 5, the secret (Aq. *ἀπόῤῥητον*, Theod., Quinta *μυστήριον*); but Nöldeke (*D. M. Z.*, xxv. 668) is perhaps right in tracing back this word directly to the primary meaning of (confidential) converse, a meaning which can be proved from the Syr. and Arab. Jahve unbosoms Himself without reserve; He speaks confidentially to those who fear Him; cf. the borrowed passage, Prov. iii. 32, and as an example of the thing itself, *vid.* Gen. xviii. 17. According to Ges., § 132, remark 1, the *inf.* with לְ in *v.* 14*b* is, as in Isa. xxxviii. 20, an expression for the *fut. periphr.*: *fœdus suum notum facturus est eis;* the position of the words is the same as in Dan. ii. 16, 18, iv. 15; הוֹדִיעַ is the imparting not merely of an intellectual but of an experimental knowledge. Hitz. translates differently: to make them to understand. But even in 2 Sam. vii. 21 the Hiph. is not to be understood thus absolutely. בְּרִיתוֹ is objective —what is meant is the rich, deep and glorious purport of the covenant revelation. The poet has now from all sides established the truth, that all good gifts come down from above, from the God of salvation, and he returns to the thought from which he started.

Ver. 15. He who has his eyes directed steadily towards God (cxli. 8, cxxiii. 1) is ever in the praying mood, which cannot remain unanswered; תָּמִיד corresponds with the *ἀδιαλείπτως* of 1 Thess. v. 17. This constant looking at God aims here at deliverance from hostile nets. It is He alone who can pull him out (xxxi. 5) of the net of entangled circumstances of life into which he has come to be ensnared, not without guilt on his own part.

Ver. 16. The translation: turn to me, suits, inasmuch as פָּנָה אֶל means an observant sympathising turning of God to one (LXX. *ἐπιβλέπειν*), lxxxvi. 16, Lev. xxvi. 9. He longs for this, for men have become estranged from him, drive him away. יָחִיד is the unique one, he who has no companion, therefore the solitary one. The assonance עָנִי אֲנִי is purposely not avoided. To whom can he, the isolated one, pour out his sorrow, lay bare his innermost heart? To God alone. To Him he can make all his complaints, to Him he can come again and again in prayer.

Ver. 17. The Hiph. הִרְחִיב means to make broad, and as an intensive: to make a broad space = to expand oneself (for the idea cf. Lam. ii. 13, "thy misfortune is as great as the sea"), LXX. *ἐπληθύνθησαν*. But as רחב is the opposite of צר, it should, in that case, be explained: they have become a wide space (Itala: *dilatatæ sunt*), and have therefore been removed, a meaning which does not accord with the prayer following. In the sense of "they have expanded themselves far and wide," the expression would be an ambiguous oxymoron. Baethgen conjectures הרחיבי (Cant. vi. 6), but that gives an affected predicate to צרות. Notwithstanding that all the old versions, like the LXX., translate the plural, the original text was undoubtedly הרחיב זמצוקתי (הַרְחִיב as lxxvii. 2, xciv. 1, or הִרְחִיב as *e.g.* 2 Kings viii. 6); enlarge the straits of my heart (cf. cxix. 32; 2 Cor. vi. 11) and bring me out of my distresses (Hitz. and others).

Vers. 18, 19. The omission of the ק is made up for by a double ר-strophe. The attempts of Ewald (קְרֵה or קַדֵּם), Hitzig (קַבֵּל), and Baur (קוּמָה ח׳) to restore a ק-strophe are violent: even the LXX. has *ἴδε* twice over. The looking prayed for is in both cases an inspection, with which is connected the idea of interposition, but so that the way and manner is left entirely with God. עָנְיִי is prostration and עָמָל *labor* = trouble. נָשָׂא לְ with a dative instead of an accusative of the object (*tollere peccata*) means to take away, *i.e.* to

bestow pardon (syn. with סָלַח). It is pleasing to the New Testament consciousness to find that God's vengeance is not expressly invoked on the enemies. כִּי is an expanding *quod* as in Gen. i. 4. שִׂנְאַת חָמָס with an attributive genitive, is hatred which springs from injustice and leads to fresh injustice.

Ver. 20. He pleads for protection and deliverance from God, and that He will not let his hope be disappointed (אַל אֲבוֹשׁ, cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 13, instead of the usual אל אבושה); this hope of his rests in Him; he has hidden himself in Him, and therefore He cannot forsake him, or let him perish.

Ver. 21. Piety, which fills the whole man, and surrenders itself completely, and is not merely half hearted and hypocritical, is called תֹּם, and integrity which follows God's will without byeways or secret ways is called יֹשֶׁר—these two fundamental virtues (cf. Job i. 1) he wishes to be his guardians on his way, which is full of danger, not only on account of external enemies, but also by reason of his own sinfulness. These are not to let him out of their eye, that he may not slip away from them (cf. xl. 12, Prov. xx. 28). He may claim this for himself, for the goal on which his eye is set is even God, from whom תֹּם and יֹשֶׁר, as good angels, come.

Ver. 22. These experiences are not singular, but as the world's enmity and sin brought him, so they bring all who belong to the people of God into similar straits. And the need of the individual will not cease till the need of the community experiences a thorough remedy. Hence the intercessory prayer of this brief closing distich, the connection of which with what has gone before is not so close as in the case of xxxiv. 23. It appears to have been first added when Ps. xxv. came to be read in the public worship of God, and this opinion is favoured by the word אלהים being used, without any apparent reason in a Psalm which is non-elohistic.[1]

[1] On this subject *vid. Symbolæ*, p. 6.

Both Psalms conclude with a supernumerary ם-strophe. At the time when these Psalms were composed the final letters were not yet invented—in Euting's tables they first appear in post-Christian monumental inscriptions, and therefore one is not to suspect in this repeated ם any attempt at giving a special representation of them, although they are sometimes represented, but not always perfectly, at the close of the synagogue hymns (*Pijutim*).

PSALM XXVI.

THE LONGING OF AN INNOCENT ONE, WHO IS BEING PERSECUTED, TO RENDER THANKS TO GOD IN HIS HOUSE.

1 Vindicate me, Jahve, for I go on in mine integrity,
And in Jahve do I trust without wavering.
2 Prove me, Jahve, and try me,
Assay both my reins and my heart.
3 For Thy grace have I before mine eyes,
And I walk in Thy truth.

4 I have not sat with dissolute people,
And with dissemblers I have no intercourse.
5 I hate the assembly of evil doers,
And with the godless I do not sit.

6 I can wash my hands in innocence,
And I fain would compass Thine altar, Jahve,
7 To join in with the voice of thanksgiving,
And to narrate all Thy wonders.
8 Jahve, I love the habitation of Thy house,
And the place where Thy glory dwelleth.

9 Snatch not away with sinners my soul,
And with bloody men my life,
10 In whose hands is infamy,
And whose right hand is full of bribery!
11 I however go on in mine integrity—
Deliver me, and be gracious unto me.

12 My foot has come to stand on a broad plain,
In the choirs of the congregation do I praise Jahve.

Similar thoughts, expressed in similar terms, form the setting of Pss. xxv. and xxvi. In the one, as in the other,

we have the writer's testimony to his confidence in God (בָּטַחְתִּי, xxv. 2, xxvi. 1); in the one, as in the other, there is the cry for deliverance out of a straitened condition (פְּדֵהוּ, xxv. 22, xxvi. 11), and for some manifestation of favour (חָנֵּנִי, xxvi. 11, xxv. 16), and besides these there are other prominent points of contact (xxvi. 11, xxv. 21; xxvi. 3, xxv. 6). These are reasons enough for placing these two Psalms near to each other. But in Ps. xxvi. we miss the acknowledgment of guilt going hand in hand with the testimony to his personal piety, that confession of sin which so corresponds to the New Testament consciousness (see above, p. 97*f.*), and which is thrice repeated in Ps. xxv.; the sharpness of the antagonism in which the Psalmist stands towards his enemies, who are here more minutely described, prevents him from giving expression to any such accusations of himself. The description suits the followers of Absalom. They are hypocrites, who have been unmasked, now that they have given in to false and bloody designs, and through bribery have been won over to their new lord, for Absalom had stolen the hearts of the men of Israel (2 Sam. xv. 6). David would not then take the tabernacle with him in his flight, but said: "If I shall find favour in the eyes of Jahve, He will bring me back, and will give me to see it, and His habitation" (2 Sam. xv. 25). That love to the house of God, which is there expressed, forms also the central subject of this Psalm.

Vers. 1–3. The poet, as one that is being persecuted, pleads for vindication and deliverance, and he bases this petition on his relation to God. שָׁפְטֵנִי, as in vii. 9, xxxv. 24; cf. xliii. 1. תֹּם (synon. תָּמִים, which, however, can take no suffix) means, according to Gen. xx. 5*f.*, 1 Kings xxii. 34, complete freedom from sinful intention, oneness of character, purity, simplicity (ἀκακία, ἁπλότης); and he bases his petition for the vindication of his violated rights on the fact that he has walked on, without cherishing or provoking enmity,

and has without wavering (לֹא אֶמְעָד, an adverbial circumstantial clause; cf. xxi. 8) trusted in Jahve. He does not self-righteously declare himself morally perfect; he only appeals to the deepest aim of his heart as being absolutely and entirely turned to God. *V.* 2, moreover, is not so much a challenge that God would satisfy Himself of his innocence as rather a prayer to prove the state of his mind; and if it be not as he himself deems, that He would make that clear to him (cxxxix. 23*f.*). בְּחַן (= محن, to try by rapping, knocking) does not here refer to a trial by trouble, but by a deep glance into his innermost heart (xi. 5, xvii. 3); נְסֵה means to lift up, so as to prove by close inspection, not in the sense of *πειράζειν*, but of *δοκιμάζειν*; צָרַף, to melt, *i.e.* by the agency of fire to separate the precious metal and the dross (xii. 7, lxvi. 10). The *Chethîb* is not to be read as a participle, צָרוּפָה (as that would be a contradiction to the prayer), but as the imperative, צָרְפָה, as when not in pause also in Isa. xxxii. 11; cf. Jud. ix. 8, 12; 1 Sam. xxviii. 8. The reins are the seat of the affections, the heart is the very centre of the spiritual, psychical life. In *v.* 3 he tells us how confidingly he sets himself in God's light. God's grace is that on which his eye is fixed, the delight of his eye, and he walks in God's truth. חֶסֶד is the divine love stooping undeservedly to meet with creatures, especially with sinners (xxv. 7); אֱמֶת is the truth with which God holds fast and works out His loving will and His word of promise. This loving-kindness of God has hitherto been steadily the model of his life, this truth of God the rule and boundary of his walk.

Vers. 4, 5. He bases his prayer on his demeanour towards the people of this world, the manner in which he has always watched his conduct, and still continues steadily to watch it. With *v.* 4*a* cf. Jer. xv. 17. מְתֵי שָׁוְא (Job xi. 11; cf. xxxi. 5 parallel with מִרְמָה), are "unreal" people, but in a deeper sense than we are wont to use this expression; שָׁוְא (*vid.* on

xxiv. 4) is dissoluteness, hollowness, worthlessness, and therefore badness (سُوء) of intention, the chaotic emptiness of alienation from God, untruth whitewashed with the lie of dissimulation (xii. 3) and therefore nothingness, the very opposite of that fulness of God and of good, which is the morally real (syn. אָוֶן, *e.g.* Job xxii. 1). נֶעְלָמִים, the veiled, are such as know how to keep their wickedness and malicious plans secret, and to mask them hypocritically, Talm. צְבוּעִים, dyed (comp. *ὑπόκριτος*, Luth., "undyed"). בּוֹא עִם (אֵת), to approach one, is equivalent to הָלַךְ אֵת, to go in and out with one (Prov. xx. 24; cf. xiii. 20). כֻּרְעָ (from רָעַע) is used of one who plots evil and does it. As to רשׁע *vid.* i. 1.

Vers. 6–8. As the motive for his prayer, the poet gives his love for God's holy temple, from which he is now far away without any guilt on his part. The voluntative imperfect וְאֶסְבְּבָה, different from וְאסבבה (*vid.* on iii. 6 and lxxiii. 16) can here mean, not as it might in another connection (Isa. xliii. 26; cf. Judg. vi. 9) *et ambibam*, but only *et ambiam;* it is an emotional continuation (cf. xxvii. 6, Cant. vii. 12, Isa. i. 24, v. 19 and freq.) of the potential אֶרְחַץ. He can wash his hands in innocence (בְּ of the condition to be attested by the act), and he will compass (lix. 7) Jahve's altar. The washing of the hands is elsewhere a symbolical act (Deut. xxi. 6; cf. Matt. xxvii. 24), it is here merely a figurative confession of his consciousness of innocence, and is naturally suggested in this form (cf. lxxiii. 13), from the idea of the priest washing himself preparatory to service (Ex. xxx. 20 *f.*) being associated with the idea of the altar. The expression used in *v.* 6 has a priestly colouring in virtue of that priestly consciousness which belongs to every Israelitish layman (Ex. xix. 6), without however going beyond what was ritually possible. For סבב may be used even of compassing in a semicircular fashion (Gen. ii. 11, Num. xxi. 4), whether it be in the immediate neighbourhood of, or at a

prescribed distance from, the centre. לְשָׁמְעַ is a syncopated and defectively written Hiph. for לְהַשְׁמִיעַ, like לְשָׁמֵד in Isa. xxiii. 11. Instead of לַשְׁמַע קוֹל תּוֹדָה, "to cause the voice of thanksgiving to be heard," it is said, as הַשְׁמִיעַ is used absolutely (1 Chron. xv. 19; 2 Chron. v. 13), and the object is regarded as the instrument of the act (Ges., § 138, 1, rem. 3): "in order to join in with the voice of thanksgiving." In the expression, "all Thy wondrous deeds," there is included the last of these, the home-bringing from the exile forced on him by Absalom, to which, in the first place, the words of thanks refer. Longing to come back, he yearns above everything else for the beautiful worship of God which is carried on round the altar in the forecourt, for he loves the habitation of God's house, the place where His doxa, revealed on earth and revealed indeed in grace, has made its abode (Symm., τὸ ἀνάκτορον). מָעוֹן does not primarily mean refuge, deliverance, protection, though it may obtain this meaning from the context, and it has a certain connection with عان, *med. waw*, to help, from whence *ʿaun*, *maʿûna*, *maʿûna*, *maʿwana*, help, specially God's help), so far as this latter word starts from the primary idea, to support, to keep upright, so that therefore מָעוֹן, like *maʿân*, means the place where one supports oneself, establishes oneself, feels oneself secure. The Kamus explains this *maʿân*, "the place on which the eye rests as the object of sight," and therefore traces it back to عان, *med. je*, and for this the phrase *hum minka bi-maʿânin*, *i.e.* as seen from your position they are on a watch tower (= on a place where you from your point of observation can see them) may be quoted. According to Hebrew usage, the fundamental idea of the word is not a watch tower, but a place of support.[1]

[1] It has been proved by Fleischer in Fürst's *Orient. Literaturblatt*, 1841, pp. 134–136, that Geiger was wrong in identifying the ماعون of the Koran (whose root is معن) with מעון.

Vers. 9–11. Now for the first time is set forth in detail the petition that had been compressed into יִשְׁפְּטֵנִי, *v.* 1. He asks (as in xxviii. 3) that God would not bind up his lot with those whose fellowship in disposition and action he had always shunned. אַנְשֵׁי דָמִים, as in v. 7; cf. *ἄνθρωποι αἱμάτων*, Sir. xxxi. 25. זִמָּה signifies elsewhere a design, and especially a bad one; here however it is a deed of shame, and that not of unnatural unchastity (for בִּידֵיהֶם would not suit that), but the scum of all that is vicious generally: they practise calculated knavery, and their right hand, which ought to support the right—David has the nobles of his nation in his eye—is full of accursed (Deut. xxvii. 25) bribery (מָלְאָה שֹׁחַד with *day. forte conj.*) for the condemnation of innocence. He, on the contrary, goes on henceforth, as formerly, in his accustomed uprightness, so that now with a yet more joyful confidence he can ask God for a judicial interposition in his favour.

Ver. 12. The epilogue: the prayer now changes into rejoicing, arising from the assurance of being heard. Hitherto he had felt himself shut up as it were in deep, trackless gorges; even now he feels himself standing בְּמִישׁוֹר,[1] upon a pleasant plain with a wide range of vision (cf. בַּמֶּרְחָב, xxxi. 9), and he now blends his song of thankful praise to God with the song of the worshipping Church. מַקְהֵלִים (feminine lxviii. 27) are the assemblies of the Church, קהל (LXX. *ἐν ἐκκλησίαις*), and their full-voiced choirs (p. 41).

PSALM XXVII.

DRAWING COURAGE FROM GOD, THE ALL-RECOMPENSING ONE.

1 Jahve is my light and my salvation,
Whom shall I fear?
Jahve is the bulwark of my life,
Of whom shall I be afraid?

[1] Like בְּמַעְגְּלֵי, xxiii. 3, and also בָּבַב, בָּפַפ, כָּכַכ, notwithstanding the vocalic final sound of the closely connected words preceding.

2 When wicked people come against me,
To eat my flesh,
Mine oppressors, and enemies upon me—
They stumble and fall.
3 Though an host encamp against me,
My heart doth not fear,
Though war should arise against me,
In spite of it am I confident.

4 One thing have I asked of Jahve,
That do I desire:
That I may dwell in the house of Jahve
All the days of my life
To behold the pleasantness of Jahve,
And to meditate in His temple.
5 For He hideth me in His pavilion
In the day of evil,
He covereth me in the shelter of His tent.
Upon a rock doth He lift me up.

6 And now shall my head be lifted up above mine enemies round about me,
And I will offer in His tabernacle sacrifices of joyful thanksgiving,
I will sing and play on the harp to Jahve.

7 Hear, Jahve, when I cry aloud: be gracious to me and answer me.
8 My heart saith to Thee: *Seek ye my face*—
This thy face, Jahve, will I seek.

9 Hide not Thy face from me,
Thrust not Thy servant forth in anger;
Thou art my help, so cast me not away
And forsake me not, O God of my salvation.
10 For my father and mother have forsaken me,
But Jahve receiveth me unto Himself.

11 Show me, Jahve, Thy way
And lead me in a plain path because of those that lie in wait for me.
12 Give me not over to the greed of mine oppressors,
For false witnesses rise up against me, and such as breathe out violence.

13 If I did not believe to see even yet Jahve's grace in the land of the living—!
14 Hope in Jahve,

Be of good courage, and let thine heart shew itself strong,
And hope in Jahve.

The same longing for Zion rings out of this Psalm as out of the preceding one. To remain all his life near to God's house is here his one prayer, and that, delivered from his enemies, he will there yet present his thankoffering, is his confident expectation. The היכל of God, the King, is at the time still an אהל, yet, in virtue of Him who sits enthroned therein, it can as well be called הֵיכָל, as the היכל shown to Ezekiel could be called אֹהֶל in remembrance of the Mosaic tabernacle (Ezek. xli. 1). Far distant from the sanctuary, the poet finds himself exposed to the dangers of threatened war, but he is as courageous in God as in iii. 7, when the war is already in full swing: *I do not fear the myriads of people who have encamped against me.* The situation is therefore similar to that of David in the time of Absalom. But this holds good only of the first half, *vv.* 1–6. In the second half *v.* 10 is not in favour of the composition being ascribed to this period. The title prefixed to the Ps. by the LXX., *πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι* (before he was anointed, namely, as is no doubt meant, in Hebron by the people) places the Psalm therefore in the time of Saul. But even in other respects, the two halves of the Psalm are very dissimilar. They form a *hysteron proteron*, the *fides triumphans* of the first half changing into *fides supplex* in the second, and with the beginning of the δέησις in *v.* 7 the style becomes cumbrous, the strophic arrangement obscure, and even the termination of the verse-lines uncertain, so that one is tempted with Olsh. and Baur, to regard *vv.* 7–14 as an appendix by another writer. The compiler, however, had the Psalm before him exactly as we now have it; for the reasons why he made it follow Ps. xxvi. are to be found in both halves; cf. *v.* 7 with xxvi. 11; and *v.* 11 with xxvi. 12.

Vers. 1–3. In this first strophe there is expressed the confident courage of faith. It is a hexastich in the cæsural

scheme. Though darkness break in upon him, the darkness of night, of trouble, of temptation: Jahve is his light, and if he is in Him, he is in the light, and there shines on him a sun which never sets, and suffers no eclipse. This beautiful, infinitely profound name of God, אוֹרִי, occurs here only; only the בָּא אוֹרֶךָ of Isa. lx. 1 (cf. *φῶς ἐλήλυθα*, John xii. 46), may be compared with it. יִשְׁעִי does not stand along with אוֹרִי as a non-figurative beside a figurative expression, for that God is light is no metaphor. David calls Him his salvation in view of all that oppresses him, and the stronghold of his life in view of all which endangers him: in Jahve he overcomes far and wide, in Him is his life hidden as in a rocky fortress (xxxi. 3). When he ascribes to the wicked, who assail him in a hostile spirit (קָרַב עַל different from קָרַב אֶל), the intention to eat his flesh, they are regarded as wild beasts. Even in Job xix. 22, to eat up one's flesh is equivalent to persecute one even to destruction by evil speaking (in Aram. by evil reports). In בְּקָרֹב the *schebâ* of the half-open syllable is made a *chateph*, as in לְשַׁכְּנִי, xxxi. 12; לְשַׁאוֹל, xlix. 15. The לִי of אֹיְבַי לִי may be regarded, as also in xxv. 2 (comp. cxliv. 2), as an intensifying of the idea of personal ill-will; but a mere repetition of the hostile subject, without that of the hostile undertaking, would be tame in the parallel member of the verse. As in Lam. iii. 60 *f.*, לִי is a variation of the preceding עָלַי. In the apodosis הֵמָּה כָּשְׁלוּ וְנָפָלוּ, the overthrow of the enemy is regarded beforehand as an accomplished fact. Holy boldness and immoveable repose are expressed in *v.* 3 even in the rhythm. The fall in 3 *a* is spondaic; he does not allow himself to be disturbed. The fall in 3 *b* is iambic; he can be bold. Hitzig is wrong when (with Raschi) he renders: "I trust in this that Jahve is my light," etc. It might have been so rendered had בזאת אני בוטח formed the conclusion of *v.* 2 but one cannot go back to *v.* 1 over *v.* 2; and why should the poet have expressed himself in so material a way,

instead of saying בִּיהוָה. No, בּוֹטֵחַ signifies, even by itself, "of good heart," *e.g.* Prov. xi. 15, and בְּזֹאת "in spite of this" (Cocceius: *hoc non obstante*), Lev. xxvi. 27 (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 32), begins the apodosis, at the head of which we expect an adversative conjunction.

Vers. 4, 5. There is but one thing he longs for, although he has, and that even among strangers and in trouble, full satisfaction in Jahve. In *v.* 4*a* the *impf.* is used along with the *perf.* in order to express an earnest longing that stretches from the past into the future, and which therefore pervades his whole life. The one thing longed for is unfolded in שִׁבְתִּי וגו׳. A lifelong residence in Jahve's house, and therefore an intimate inward intercourse with the God who has His dwelling (בַּיִת), His residence (הֵיכָל) in the holy tent, is the one heart's desire of David, so that he may delight himself by gazing (חָזָה בְּ is used of a clinging, lingering, entranced gazing, and is therefore more significant than חָזָה with the acc. lxiii. 3) on נֹעַם ה׳ (xc. 17), the gracious pleasantness of Jahve, *i.e.* the gracious revelation of Him that can be seen there by the spiritual eye. The interpretation *amœnitas* = *amœnus cultus* takes hold of the idea from the wrong side. That בָּקַר בְּ should be intended as synonymous with חָזָה בְּ in the sense of a lingering, pleased contemplation (Hupf., Hitz.), is contrary to the meaning of the verb, which signifies to investigate (with לְ to search for a thing, to spy, Lev. xiii. 36), to reflect upon; even the post-biblical signification: to visit, especially the sick (whence בְּקוּר חוֹלִים) springs from the primary meaning, *investigare*. It would give a suitable sense here to regard it as a denom. from בֹּקֶר: "and to appear early in His temple" (Dunasch, Raschi), but there is no need to abandon the *usus loquendi*. Hengstenberg is right in retaining the signification, to reflect upon. בְּהֵיכָלוֹ is a designation of the place consecrated to meditation, and לְבַקֵּר is used of that inquiring contemplation which loses itself in God, who is there revealed. In *v.* 5 David justifies his wish

by stating what he finds in God's sanctuary; the imperfects tell what Jahve, with His sanctuary, will bestow on him. It is a sheltering asylum on a hill, where Jahve safely guards him who flees thither, from the storms of trouble without; there he is inaccessible to any dangers, he has them far beneath him, and his feet rest on a rock. As in xxxi. 21 the *Chethîb* may, with Ewald, § 257 *d*, be read בְּסֻכָּה; but סֹךְ here alternates with אֹהֶל; and in the poetic style the former (lxxvi. 3, Lam. ii. 6) takes the place of סֻכָּה, not by itself, t is true, but certainly with suffixes.[1]

Ver. 6. With וְעַתָּה the poet predicts inferentially (cf. ii. 10) the fulfilment of the earnest longing, the guarantee of which lies in the very longing itself. By זִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה are not meant sacrifices on the occasion of which the priests blew with trumpets (Grätz), for that never took place in connection with sacrifices offered by individuals, but only in connection with those offered by the community (Num. x. 10): nor are war-cry sacrifices (Baur), *i.e.* sacrifices preparing for the battle, meant, for the וְאָזְבְּחָה implies that struggle and victory are past; תְּרוּעָה is rather the synon. of תּוֹדָה, xxvi. 7, and זִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה is a climactic expression for זִבְחֵי תוֹדָה, cvii. 22, *i.e.* (cf. זִבְחֵי צֶדֶק, iv. 6, li. 21) offerings of

[1] In exactly the same way we find in the poetic style צִיָּדָה, cxxxii. 15; פִּנָּה, Prov. vii. 8; מָדָה, Job xi. 9; גָּלָה, Zech. iv. 2, and perhaps also נָצָה, Gen. xl. 10, used instead of צִידָתָה, פִּנָּתָה, מָדָתָה, גָּלָתָה, נָצָתָה, just as we occasionally find shorter forms introduced in the inflexion, though these do not occur in the corresponding principal forms, *e.g.* צוּרֵם, xlix. 15, instead of צוּרָתָם; מְגוּרֵם, lv. 16, instead of מְגוּרָתָם; בִּעַרְתָּם, Job v. 13, instead of בִּעַרְתָּתָם; כִּתְבוּנֵם, Hos. xiii. 2, instead of כִּתְבוּנָתָם; פִּחֵם, Neh. v. 14, instead of פִּחָתָם; perhaps also טֵהֲרָה, Lev. xii. 6, instead of טֵהֲרָתָה, cf. Hitzig on Hos. xiii. 2: Ewald in *D.M.Z.*, i. 336*f.* and § 257*d*; Böttcher's *Neue Aehrenlese*, No. 693. Similar to this syncope is the apocope of the feminine ending in the Arabic vocative (the so-called ترخيم, *emollitio*), *e.g.* يَا عُبَ, *o host* for عُبَّة *vid.* Zamachśari, *Mufaṣṣal*, p. ٢٢.

jubilant gratitude: he will bring offerings in which his gratitude will be displayed, and with the accompaniment of stringed instruments he will sing hymns of thanksgiving to Him who has again gloriously shown Himself his deliverer.

Vers. 7, 8. Vows of thanksgiving, on the presupposition of the hearing of prayer and the fulfilment of what was asked, are elsewhere common at the conclusion of a Psalm. But in this one prayer now begins for the first time. The transition is brought about by means of the preceding notion of present danger from enemies round about him. The reality, which in the first half of the Psalm had been overcome by faith and had vanished from sight, here makes itself consciously felt. We are not to translate, as is done by the Vulg.: *Exaudi Domine vocem qua clamavi* (rather *clamo*) *ad te* (the introit of the *Dominica expectationis* in the interval between Ascension and Pentecost); שְׁמַע has *Dechî*, and accordingly קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא, *voce mea* (as in iii. 5) *clamo*, is a circumstantial clause (cf. iv. 3 and with Isa. i. 5*a*)=*voce mea clamante me*. In *v.* 8 לְךָ cannot possibly be so taken that לְ should be *Lamed auctoris* (Dath., Olsh.): Thine, saith my heart, is (the utterance): seek ye My face. The declaration is opposed to this sense, artificially put upon it. לְךָ אָמַר without doubt go together, and what the heart says to Jahve is not: seek ye my face, but on the ground and as the echo of this (Calvin: *velut Deo succinens*): therefore will I seek Thy face. Just as in the case of Job xlii. 3*f.*, a personal inference is drawn directly from divine words directly quoted. In the periodic style, בַּקְּשׁוּ פָנַי would have to be transposed thus: since Thou hast permitted and exhorted us, or: in conformity with Thine invitation, that we should seek Thy face, do I seek Thy face (Hupf.). There is no reference to this or that passage in the Thora, such as Deut. iv. 29. The prayer is not based on any particular passage of Scripture, but upon the commands and promises of God in general.

Vers. 9, 10. The importunate petitions are now poured

out with all the greater freedom, that God may be willing to be invoked and entreated. The *Hiph.* הִטָּה here by itself means (cf. Job xxiv. 4): to throw aside, to push aside. The clause, עֶזְרָתִי הָיִיתָ, neither says: be Thou my help (that is syntactically impossible), nor is it to be understood relatively: Thou who wast my help (for there is nothing to support this rendering in what precedes); the preterite rather assigns the ground for the prayer which follows: my help art Thou (literally, hast Thou become, or hast ever been)—therefore cast me not away; and it is accented accordingly. As has been already remarked, *v.* 10 does not sound as if from David's lips, for all that is said of him in the time of Saul's persecution is, that he had to part from his parents (1 Sam. xxii. 3*f.*). The words might certainly be David's if 10*a* admitted, with Hupf. and Ewald, § 362 *b*, of being taken hypothetically: should my father and my mother forsake me, Jahve will, etc.; but for the prayer "forsake me not," the reason follows naturally: for my father and mother have forsaken me; and just as naturally does the consolation: but Jahve will take me up, prepare the way for the petitions which begin afresh in *v.* 11; while on the other hand, if כִּי is taken hypothetically, *v.* 11 stands isolated between petitions on either side. On יַאַסְפֻנִי cf. Josh. xx. 4.

Vers. 11, 12. He wanders about presently like a hunted deer; but God can so guide him that he may escape all dangers. That is what he asks. As in cxliii. 10, מִישׁוֹר is to be taken in an ethical sense, quite differently from xxvi. 12. As to שׁוֹרְרִים see the primary passage v. 9, of which we have an echo here. Cunning spies follow all his steps, and would rejoice, if they saw what they planned and wished come to pass. Should he slide into the way of sin leading to destruction, that would be to God's dishonour, just as on the other hand it is a point of honour with God not to allow His servant to fall. Hence he prays that he may be led in God's way; for oneness of one's own will with the divine

renders one invulnerable. נֶפֶשׁ, *v.* 12, just as in xvii. 9, and in the similar passage xli. 3, which is also genuinely Davidic, means passion or greed, because the soul in its natural basis is selfishness and covetousness. יָפִחַ is a secondary form of יָפִיחַ: wont to breathe out, *i.e.* either to speak out, or to snort (cf. *πνεῖν* or *ἐμπνεῖν φόνον* and *φόνον, θυμοῦ*, and the like, Acts ix. 1). In both Hitz. sees participles of the verb יָפַח (Jer. iv. 31); but x. 5 and Hab. ii. 3 point to פּוֹחַ (פִּיחַ).

Vers. 13, 14. He encourages himself to a more confident faith. When connected with *v.* 12 (Aben Ezra, Kimchi), *v.* 13 drags badly, unless with Grätz we were to break up לוּלֵא into לִי and לֵא, connecting the former with *v.* 12, and then proceeding: I believed not . . . *i.e.* I expected that under such persecution I should perish. That commends itself. But as the text lies before us now, we must assume with Gei., Dachselt, and others, that the protasis with its לוּלֵא, which according to the Masora (cf. *Berachoth*, 4 *a*) is pointed with three marks above[1] and four below, and which is half attested by the LXX. (*ἑαυτῇ*) and altogether by the Targ. (yet by no other ancient translation), has no apodosis; cf. the case of a protasis with לוּ, but with no apodosis, Gen. l. 15, and those of an apodosis with כִּי following לוּלֵי, Gen. xxxi. 42, xliii. 10, 1 Sam. xxv. 34, 2 Sam. ii. 27 (also Num. xxii. 33 where לוּלֵי = אִם לֹא = אוּלַי), which are similarly to be explained *per aposiopesin*. The perfect following לוּלֵא (לוּלֵי) has sometimes the sense of a pluperfect (as in Gen. xliii. 10 *nisi cunctati essemus*), and sometimes that of an imperfect, as here (cf. Deut. xxxii. 29 *si saperent*). The poet does not speak of a former faith, but in reference to a present need, which still lasts, of a present faith. The apodosis ought perhaps to run (cxix. 92, xciv. 17) thus: if I did not believe, if I did not preserve my confidence . . . then (כִּי אָז or אָז) I should perish, or: then I should almost perish. But he

[1] The ו has no mark above it, as it might easily be mistaken for *cholem*. *Vid.* Baer, Psalterium (1861), p. 130. Strack, *Proleg.*, p. 90.

has such faith, and he encourages himself accordingly, *v.* 14, to confident patience; he addresses himself; it is as it were the believing portion of his soul addressing the despondent and weaker portion. Instead of וְאֶמַּץ (Deut. xxxi. 7), it is said, as in xxxi. 25, וְיַאֲמֵץ לִבֶּךָ, let thy heart show itself strong. The translation: may He (Jahve) strengthen thine heart (Hupf., v. Gerl.) would require יְאַמֵּץ; but הֶאֱמִיץ, like הֶרְחִיב, xxv. 17, belongs to the class of intensive denominatives, in which Hebrew is by no means poor, and in which Arabic is specially rich.

PSALM XXVIII.

A CRY FOR HELP AND THANKSGIVING IN A TIME OF REBELLION.

1 Unto Thee, O Jahve, do I cry;
My rock, be not deaf unto me,
Lest, if Thou be silent unto me, I become like those that go down into the pit.
2 Hear the voice of my supplication, when I cry unto Thee,
When I lift up my hands to Thy holy sanctuary.
3 Drag me not away with the ungodly and with those that work iniquity,
Who speak peace to their neighbours,
While evil is in their hearts.
4 Give them according to their doings and the evil of their deeds,
According to the work of their hands give them,
Requite them what they have done!
5 For they give no heed unto the doings of Jahve,
Nor unto the work of His hands—
He will pull them down, not build them up.

6 Blessed be Jahve,
For He hath heard my loud supplication!
7 Jahve is my defence and my shield,
In Him my heart trusted and I was helped—
Therefore my heart exulteth, and with my song do I praise Him.
8 Jahve is a defence to them,
And the saving defence of His anointed is He.

9 O help Thy people
And bless Thy heritage,
And feed them, and carry them for evermore.

To Psalms xxvi. and xxvii. there is here added a third belonging to the time of David's persecution by Absalom. In this one also the longing for God's sanctuary cannot be ignored, and, in addition to this, we have also, what can be rightly estimated only when taken in connection with the circumstances of that time, the intercession of the anointed one, who is himself in danger, for the people, who stand no less in need of deliverance. Like Ps. xxvii., this one, placed close to it, also falls into two parts, but these, even though they be of different dates, yet bear a similar poetic impress. They both consist of verses of two or three lines each. This Psalm resembles xxvii. in several ways, *e.g.* in speaking of God as מעוז; but cf. also *v.* 3 with xxvi. 9; *v.* 2 with xxxi. 23; *v.* 9 with xxix. 11. Numerous echoes of this Psalm are to be found not only in Jeremiah, but also in Isaiah.

Vers. 1–5. This first half, *vv.* 1–5, is supplicatory. The preposition מִן with the verbs חָרַשׁ, to be deaf, dumb, and חָשָׁה to be silent, pregnantly denotes an aversion which considers the suppliant not worthy of an answer. Jahve is his צוּר, his ground of confidence; but if He continues thus to be silent, then he who trusts in Him will become like to those who are going down (xxii. 30), or who have already gone down, to the pit (Isa. xiv. 19): the past participle corresponds better with the situation of one who finds himself already on the edge of the abyss. In the double sentence with פֶּן the main accent falls on the second clause, which the first but prepares the way for in a paratactical manner (cf. Isa. v. 4, xii. 1), in Latin *ne, te mihi non respondente, similis fiam.* Olsh. and, with him, Baur believe that, because וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי has not as a *perf. consec.* the accent on the *ultima*, it must be explained according to the accentuation: "that Thou mayest

be no longer silent, while I have already become like." But that ought to be וְאֲנִי נִמְשָׁל, or at least וְאֲנִי נִמְשַׁלְתִּי. And if ונמשלתי were to be regarded as an actual perfect, then it ought rather to be translated: "and I should then be like." But after all וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי, although *Milel*, is a *perf. consecutivum* ("and I am become like"); for when, in a sentence of several members following כֵּן, the *imperf.*, as is usual (*vid.* on xxxviii. 17), passes over into the *perf.*, the latter has most commonly it is true the accent. of the *perf. consec.* (Deut. iv. 19, Jud. xviii. 25, Prov. v. 9–12, Mal. iii. 24), but not always: the penultimate accentuation remains necessarily with the two great pausal accents, *Silluk* and *Athnach*, Deut. viii. 12, Prov. xxx. 6, 9, 10, here with *Rebîa mugrasch*, just as generally speaking the *perf. consec.*, in greater pauses always, and in smaller ones sometimes, retains its penultimate accentuation *e.g.* with *Rebîa mugrasch*, xix. 14, Prov. xxiii. 8, xxx. 9, with *Rebîa*, Prov. xxx. 9, cf. on the other hand Ezek. xiv. 17; with *Zakef*, 1 Sam. xxix. 8, and even with *Tifcha*, Obad. *v.* 10, Jonah iv. 21; but of this the national grammarians know nothing. The point towards which the Psalmist stretches his imploring hands is Jahve's holy דְּבִיר (Theodotion: δαβείρ). This word (after the form בְּרִית, כְּלִיא, עֲטִין) is used elsewhere only in the Books of Kings and Chronicles of the Holy of Holies, not as being the χρηματιστήριον (Aq., Symm.) or the λαλητήριον, *oraculum* (Jerome), as it were Jahve's audience chamber (Hengst.)—a meaning not according with the form of the word—but as being the innermost part of the tent, from דָּבַר, Arab. *dabara*, to be behind, to go backwards (transit. to bring backwards, or generally, to remove), whence *dubr* (Talm. דּוּבַר), what is behind (opposite of *ḳubl*, *ḳibal* what is in front). The prayer is expanded in *vv.* 3, 4; מָשַׁךְ (for which we have in xxvi. 9, אָסַף), to draw violently down to destruction, or to drag to the place of judgment, Ezek. xxxii. 20; cf. x. 9, Job xxiv. 22. The description of the godless David takes from his present actual enemies. Were he to succumb to them,

then his fate would be like that which awaits them, to whom in his innermost heart he knows that he is quite unlike. He therefore prays that God's recompensing justice may anticipate him, *i.e.* that He would give them according to their deserts, before he succumbs, as they had feigned to him שָׁלוֹם, a good understanding, whereas they had cherished in their hearts the רָעָה, now unveiled (cf. Jer. ix. 7). נָתַן is used of judicial adjudication, as in Hos. ix. 14, Jer. xxxii. 19. The repetition of תָּנֵם is like xxvii. 14—a favourite form of repetition in both parts of the Book of Isaiah. The expression הֵשִׁיב גְּמוּל (שִׁלֵּם), common in the prophets, means to recompense or to repay to one his doing or his exhibition of himself, *i.e.* what he has done or deserved; the thoughts and the expression remind one especially of Isa. iii. 8–11, i. 16. The right to ask for retribution is based *v.* 5 on their blindness to God's righteous and gracious doings in human history (cf. Isa. v. 12, xxii. 11). The antithesis of בָּנָה and הָרַס to pull down (with a personal object, as in Ex. xv. 7) is after the manner of Jeremiah (xlii. 10; cf. i. 10, xviii. 9, and freq. Sir. xlix. 7). In 5*a* David thinks pre-eminently of this, that they shamefully fail to recognise how gloriously and graciously God has ever again and again acknowledged him as His chosen one. He has received, 2 Sam. vii., the promise, that God would build him a house, *i.e.* that He would establish his kingdom for ever. The followers of Absalom are in rebellion against this divine appointment. They shall therefore experience the very opposite of the promise given by God to David: Jahve will pull them down and not build them up, He will destroy at its very beginning this dynasty set up in opposition to Him.

Ver. 6–9. The first half prayed for deliverance and for judgment; the second half gives thanks for both. If the poet wrote the Psalm at one sitting, there now dawns upon him the certainty of being heard. But it is also possible that he added this second half later, as a memorial of the

fulfilment of prayer experienced by him (Hitz., Ewald). It reads, at any rate, like an account of what has actually taken place. Jahve is his defence and shield. The connected perfects in 7 *b* indicate that which as a matter of fact is closely united; and in the *consec. imperf.*, as often (*e.g.* Job xiv. 2), the historical signification recedes before the more essential idea of that which has been brought about. In מְשִׁירִי the song is here for once thought of as the source of the הוֹדוֹת, and instead of אוֹדֶנּוּ we have the graver form אֲהוֹדֶנּוּ, the syncope being omitted as in xlv. 18, cxvi. 6, 1 Sam. xvii. 47. From suffering springs song, and from song springs the praise of Him who turned the suffering, as *vv.* 6 and 8 celebrate it. The *αὐτοί*, who are intended by לָמוֹ, 8 *a*, are the people of Israel, as in xii. 8, Isa. xxxiii. 2 (Hitz.); the LXX. (*κραταίωμα τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*) and the Syr. read לְעַמּוֹ as in xxix. 11, a reading which Böttch., Olsh., Hupf., and König approve of, but who are meant by לָמוֹ is self-evident. David thinks first of all of the people, then of himself; for his personality retreats behind his office, in virtue of which he is Israel's head. For that very reason his deliverance is the deliverance of Israel, to whom, so far as they have become unfaithful to His anointed, Jahve has requited this unfaithfulness, and to whom, so far as they have remained faithful to him, He has rewarded this fidelity. Jahve is עֻזָּ֫לָמוֹ (punctuation as in Isa. xxvi. 1, *Michlol*, 205 *a*), inasmuch as He powerfully preserves them from the destruction into which they themselves or others might have plunged them, and He is His anointed's מָעוֹז יְשׁוּעוֹת, inasmuch as He surrounds him like an inaccessible place of refuge, which secures to him salvation in all its fulness, instead of the devised destruction. Israel's salvation and blessing were at stake, but Israel is God's people and God's inheritance—may He then work salvation for them, and bless them throughout all the future. Apostatised from David, it was a flock in the hands of hirelings—may He therefore do the part of a

shepherd to them for all time, and carry them in His arms through all destruction. The נִישָּׂאֵם, conjoined with וְרוֹמְמֵם (pointed with *Chatef* to secure the length of the initial *û*, *vid.* König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 72*f.*), reminds us of Deut. i. 31: Jahve carried Israel as a man carries his son, and Ex. xix. 4, Deut. xxxii. 11: as on eagles' wings. The *Pi.*, as in Isa. lxiii. 9, is used of carrying the weak, whom one lifts up, and so removes from helplessness and danger. Thus Ps. iii. also closes, viz. with intercession; Ps. xxix. closes similarly, but with promises, and therefore it is placed next to Ps. xxviii.

PSALM XXIX.

THE PSALM OF THE SEVEN THUNDERS.

1 Give unto Jahve, ye sons of God,
Give unto Jahve glory and might!
2 Give unto Jahve the glory of His name,
Pay homage to Jahve in holy pomp!

3 The voice of Jahve is upon the waters,
The God of glory thundereth,
Jahve is upon the great waters.
4 The voice of Jahve goeth forth in power,
The voice of Jahve goeth forth in majesty.

5 The voice of Jahve breaketh the cedars,
Yea, Jahve breaketh the cedars of Lebanon,
6 And maketh them skip like a calf,
Lebanon and Sirion like a young antelope.
7 The voice of Jahve flameth forth quivering fire.

8 The voice of Jahve shaketh the wilderness,
Jahve shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh.
9 The voice of Jahve maketh the hinds to calve,
He strippeth the forest—
And in His temple everything saith: "Glory!"

10 Jahve hath sat on the flood,
And Jahve sitteth a king for ever.
11 Jahve will give power to His people,
Jahve will bless His people with peace.

The occasion of this Psalm is a thunder-storm, but it does not limit itself to the external natural phenomenon, but in it perceives the self-attestation of the God of redemptive history. Just as the second half of Ps. xix. seven times gives the name יי to the God revealed in redemption, as distinguished from the God revealed in nature, so in this Psalm קול יי is repeated seven times, so that it may be called the Psalm of the ἑπτὰ βρονταί (Rev. x. 3*f.*). During the time of the second temple it was sung, as the addition to the superscription given in the LXX: ἐξοδίου (ἐξόδου) σκηνῆς = (σκηνοπηγίας) implies, on *Schemini Azereth*, the last day (ἐξόδιον, Lev. xxiii. 36) of the Feast of Tabernacles; a marginal note as to the date in the LXX. in the Ambrosian Hexapla codex says: "that is on the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles." [1] Between two tetrastichs, each of which names יי four times, there are placed three pentastichs, which in their sevenfold קול יי represent the thunder peals following in rapid succession as the storm increases.

[1] The שיר of the temple liturgy on *Schemini Azereth* is not explicitly given in the Talmud (*vid. Tosafoth* to *Succa*, 47 *a*, where, according to *Sofrim*, c. 19, § 2, and a statement of the Jerusalem Tal., Ps. vi. or xii. is pitched upon); we merely know, that Psalm xxix. is one of the psalm pieces for the intermediate days during the Feast of Tabernacles, which are included in the *vox memorialis* הומ"בהו (*Succa*, 55 *a*, cf. Raschi on *Joma*, 3 *a*), viz. Ps. xxix. (ה); l. 16 (ו); xciv. 16 (מ); xciv. 8 (ב); lxxxi. 7 (ה); lxxxii. 5 *b* (ו); and moreover the tractate *Soferim*, c. 18, § 3, mentions Ps. xxix. as the Psalm for Pentecost, and the tradition of the synagogue, which is now current, knows it only as a festival Psalm for the first day of Schabuoth; the Psalm for *Schemini Azereth* is lxv. The only confirmation of the statement in the LXX. is to be found in Sohar, for there (*Parasche* צו) Ps. xxix. is connected with the pouring out of water on the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles (*Hosianna rabba*), since it is said, that by means of the seven קולות (answering to the seven compassings of the altar) seven of the Sephiroth open the flood gates of heaven. Bar-Hebræus also explains the marginal note of the LXX. as referring to the concluding acts of the Feast of Tabernacles, *vid.* Emanuel Fuchs, *Die Scholien des Bar-Hebræus zum* xxiii. *und* xxix. *Ps.* 1871.

Vers. 1, 2. This Psalm has to do with a revelation of the power of the God, who is enthroned in the heavens, and who from there rules the world. And so the Psalm at its commencement addresses the heavenly spirits that surround the Ruler of the world. The Greek and Syrian translators, and Jerome, misapply בני אלים to young rams about to be offered in sacrifice; but the reading אלים, for which אילים would have been expected, might have saved them from this misconception. The angels, who are elsewhere termed בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (*e.g.* Job ii. 1), are here called בְּנֵי אֵלִים, as in lxxxix. 7. Since אֵלִים is never used for God like אלהים, but for gods (Ex. xv. 11, Dan. xi. 36), בני אלים is to be taken as a double plural (Ges., Ew., Riehm) of בֶּן־אֵל, like בָּתֵּי כְלָאִים, Isa. xlii. 22; cf. also נְּבוֹרֵי חֲיָלִים, 1 Chron. vii. 5, and the words are to be translated "sons of God," not "sons of gods." These, the begotten of God, *i.e.* created in the image of God, who, with God their Father, form as it were one family ("the family above"), are here called upon to give to God כָּבוֹד וָעֹז (see the primary passage, Deut. xxxii. 3), *i.e.* willingly and joyfully to render back to Him, as an echo, in praises the acknowledgment of His glory and might, as these have been revealed, and are yet to be revealed, in the world He has created, and to give Him the glory of His name, *i.e.* to praise His glorious name (lxxii. 19), according as it deserves. הבו, although it has to be pronounced הָבוּ, not הַבוּ, has here in all the three instances the tone on the last syllable (cf. on the other hand Job vi. 22, and the anomaly, in Deut. xxxii. 3). הַדְרַת קֹדֶשׁ is holy vestments, ornamented festal garments (2 Chron. xx. 21; cf. cx. 3).[1] A revelation of the power of God is near at hand. The heavenly spirits are to prepare themselves for it with all their power of outward display. If the summons in *v.* 2 were made to the Church below, or,

[1] The reading בְּחֶרְדַּת (with holy trembling), proposed in *Berachoth* 30 *b*, has never become a various reading. The LXX. reads בַּחֲצֵרוֹת קָדְשׁוֹ, as also in xcvi. 9 (cf. Isa. lxii. 9), and translates this ἐν αὐλῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

as in xcvi. 9, to the inhabitants of the earth, there must have been some indication of the change; the call, therefore, in *v.* 2, just as *v.* 1, is addressed to the priests of the heavenly הֵיכָל. The Church pleading in the Psalms feels herself so united with the spirits before the throne of God, that she speaks to them, and as it were in the lofty consciousness of being herself a representative of the cause of God, and a choir leader in God's service in heaven and on earth, calls upon them (ciii. 20, cxlviii. 2) to utter the praises of God. In the Apocalypse, too, songs of praise, and the sounding of trumpets, by angels precede God's judgments.

Ver. 3–9. Now follows the description of the revelation of God's power, which is the ground of the foregoing summons and is to be the subject of praise. The All-glorious One makes Himself heard in the voice (Rev. x. 3*f.*) of the thunder, and reveals Himself in the storm. There are fifteen lines, which are naturally divided into three strophes of five lines each. The chief thing to the poet, however, is the קוֹל יְ׳ repeated seven times. Although קוֹל is sometimes used almost as a loud exclamatory "Hark!" (Gen. iv. 10, Is. lii. 8), we must not apply this with Ew., § 286*f.* to the קוֹל יְ׳ of our Psalm, which has for its theme the world-moving voice of God, who makes Himself known from the heavens; the dull-sounding קוֹל serves not only as a designation of the thunder of the storm, but also as that of the thunder of the earthquake or of the roaring of the tempest, and in general of any loud sound, whereby God makes Himself perceived by the world, especially in the way of the wrathful side of His doxa. The waters in *v.* 3 are not the waters beneath; and so the question arises, Which waters are meant? Were it the waters of the Mediterranean that are meant, they would have been more clearly described in such a vivid delineation. It is much more appropriate to the commencement of this description to understand the masses of water gathered together in the black thick storm clouds (*vid.*

xviii. 12, Jer. x. 13). The roaring of Jahve is, as the poet himself explains it in 3*b*, the thunder produced by the אֵל הַכָּבוֹד (cf. מלך הכבוד, xxiv. 7) above, that which rolls over the water floods that float above the earth in the sky. Like 3*a* and 3*c*, 4*a* and 4*b* are also independent noun clauses: the roaring of Jahve goes on, passes by; the article after ב is, as in lxxvii. 14, Ex. xv. 6, 11, Prov. xxiv. 5 (cf. Prov. viii. 8, Luke iv. 32, *ἐν ἰσχύϊ* Rev. xviii. 2) the generic article: the roaring goes on in the complete realization of that which is power and majesty. In *v.* 3 the first thunderings can be heard, in *v.* 4 the storm draws nearer, and the peals become louder; now it discharges itself in its full power; 5*a* describes this in general, 5*b* specializes it: it is cedars of Lebanon, which the lightning, descending amid the rolling of the thunder, splits. The mood of sequence in *vv.* 5, 6, 9 is not historical, but only consecutive: ו *copul.* would connect them on the same level; ו *consecutive* developes the one out of the other, rises from the one to the other. The suffix in 6*a* does not proleptically refer to the mountains afterwards named, but naturally to the cedars (Hengst., Hupf., Hitz.), which bend down in the storm, and start up again; the skipping of Lebanon and Sirion, however, is not to be regarded as meaning that their wooded tops bend down and rise again, but, after cxiv. 4, refers to their being shaken by the crash of the thunder, a feature in the picture which sets forth figuratively the apparent shaking of the ground during a severe thunderstorm. שִׂרְיֹן is, according to Deut. iii. 9, the Sidonian name for Hermon, and therefore includes Lebanon and Antilebanon; according to the Masora (see Norzi on Deut. iii. 9) the word has שׂ *sinistrum*, and is therefore שִׂרְיֹן, and accordingly Hitzig is correct in deriving it from שָׁרַר, *f. i*, to gleam, to sparkle (cf. the passage of the Arabic poet quoted at cxxxiii. 3). The storm makes these mountains leap (Luth., *lecken*, *i.e.* according to his own gloss, to leap, to skip) like a young calf (cf. *vitulari*, used of bounding

gladness) and like young antelopes. רְאֵם is originally, like *βούβαλος*, *βούβαλις*, a general name for the antelope and for the buffalo, which even yet roams in herds through the woods beyond Jordan (for there are antelopes like buffaloes, and also, apart from the formation of the head and the divided hoofs, like horses); but the word means specifically the oryx leucoryx.[1] The LXX. translates: *ὡς υἱὸς μονοκερώτων*. Are we to understand by this the unicorn depicted on Persian and African monuments? Is this unicorn different from the one-horned antelope? As yet the unicorn has never been seen by any traveller, nor has the one-horned antelope. Both animals, and therefore also their relation to each other, are at present quite indefinable in the sphere of natural history.[2] Each thunder-peal is followed immediately

[1] *Vid.* Hommel, *Namen der Säugethiere bei den südsemitischen Völkern* (1879), pp. 257–260, according to whom רְאֵם is the special name for the oryx antelope. The name however is not zoologically so exact and precise—it includes also the wild ox; cf. Wetzstein on Job (second edition), p. 507*f.*, according to whom רְאֵם, though not so always, yet in Job xxxix. 9-12 is the name of the wild ox, which is so named from its glittering white. Names with similar meanings are مها and لأى, its feminine, لآءة, Heb. לְאֵה, wild cow, Assyr. *arḫu* and *lâ*, fem. *lêtu*, synon. with *alpu*, *šûru*, and *rîmu*. As to the Assyrian hunting of *rîm*, which in Assyrian texts appears to be at times an *ox*, and at other times a hill climber, *vid.* G. Rawlinson: *Five Great Monarchies*, vol. i. (1871), p. 514.

[2] The Ethiopic translation of Job xxxix. 9 renders the *μονοκέρως* of the LXX. by the Ethiopic word for rhinoceros. Among the Persians the unicorn (*kergedan*, *kerg*) is counted with the species *gôˊ*, to which species the deer and the buffalo also belong (*D. M. Z.*, xxxvi. 63). In Egypt it is called *charnîn* (from خرن = قرن), but the unicorn *charnît*. "In the year 1862 the French archæologist, M. Waddington, was with me at Damascus, when an antiquary brought to me an ancient vessel, on which a great many animals were engraved, with their names found written on their bellies. Among the well-known animals there was also a unicorn, exactly like a zebra or a horse, but with a long horn standing out on its forehead; on its body was the word خرنيت. M. Waddington wished to have the vessel, and I gave it up to him, and he took it with him to Paris. We talked a good deal about this unicorn, and believed we must finally

by the lightning: קוֹל יְהוָה חֹצֵב לַהֲבוֹת אֵשׁ (*vid.* *Wickes*, p. 51). Jahve's roaring cleaveth flames of fire, *i.e.* forms (as it were λατομεῖ) the fire material of the storm-clouds into cloven tongues of fire, lightning flashes darting along, by which one may observe that קוֹל ה׳ denotes not merely the thunder as a phenomenon, but at the same time God's omnipotent power revealing itself therein. The brevity of *v.* 7 and the threefold division of it depict the incessant zig-zag darting of the lightning (*tela trisulca*, *ignes trisulci* in Ovid). The storm moves on from the northern hills towards the south of Palestine into the Arabian desert, viz. as is said in 8*b* (cf. *v.* 5, according to the scheme of parallelism with reservation), the desert region of Kadesh (K. Barnea), which, however we may determine its position (*vid.* Wetzstein, Excurs. iii. on Genesis), must have in any case been near the steep western slopes of the mountains of Edom towards the Arabah. Jahve's roaring, namely the thunderstorm, makes that wilderness to whirl, inasmuch as it drives the sand (חוֹל) in whirling columns before it,[1] and among the mountains it (*i.e.* the violent lightning and thundering) makes the hinds (the female deer) to writhe, inasmuch as from fright they bring forth prematurely; both the *Hiph.* יָחִיל and *Pil.* יְחוֹלֵל are meant causatively. The poet proceeds with וַיֶּחֱשֹׂף, since he makes one effect of the storm to be developed as it were out of the other: יְעָרוֹת is a poetic form of the plural, and חָשַׂף describes the effect of the storm, which "peels" the woods, inasmuch as it beats down the branches, the foliage, and the tops of the trees. While Jahve thus reveals Himself from heaven down upon the earth in His irresistible almightiness, בְּהֵיכָלוֹ, in His heavenly palace (xi. 4, xviii. 7), כֻּלּוֹ, (notice

come to the conclusion that the form of the fabulous animal might have become known to the Arabs at the time of the Crusades, when the English coat of arms came to Syria."—Wetzstein.

[1] From this whirling the sand is called חוֹל; and, according to Wetzstein חֲוִילָה is equivalent to ארץ החולות, *arḍ elḥâlât*, the downs.

how בהיכלו evolves from itself this כלו), *i.e.* each of the beings there, says: כָּבוֹד. That which the poet has demanded of them (*vv.* 1, 2) now takes place. Jahve receives back His glory, which is immanent in the world, in a thousand-voiced echo of adoration.

Ver. 10, 11. Luther translates: "The Lord sits to prepare a flood," thus putting a meaning into the unintelligible translation of the Vulgate and the Septuagint, and that too one which is equally in accordance with the language—for יָשַׁב לְ must certainly be understood after the analogy of ישב למשפט (cxxii. 5; cf. ix. 8 with ix. 5)—as with the context, for the poet has not hitherto expressly thought of the torrents of rain in which the storm discharges itself. Kurtz, too, and Riehm, and others, by מבול[1] understand the quasi-flood of the rain-torrents of the storm. But it is not said לְמבול, but לַמבול, and הַמַּבּוּל occurs exclusively (Gen. vi.–xi.) as the name of the Great Flood. Each storm, however, brings into remembrance this great act of judgment, and also its gracious issue, for it appears in the sacred history as the first appearance of a storm of thunder and rain, and of the peace-speaking bow in the clouds. The reference to this is also confirmed in the third place by the consecutive imperfect, וַיֵּשֶׁב (Hoffmann, *Schriftb.*, i. 209). Ap., rightly, *κύριος εἰς κατακλυσμὸν ἐκάθισεν καὶ καθεδεῖται* . . . Jahve, says the poet, sat (upon His throne) at the Flood (to execute it), and in consequence of this, or since then, as this His present manifestation in the thunderstorm shows, He sits (enthroned) as King for ever, since from heaven (cxv. 16) He rules down upon the earth in wrath and in grace, judging and blessing. Here on earth He has a people whom from above He endows with a share in His own power, and blesses with peace (ב as also in Gen. xxiv. 1), while the tempests of His

[1] Not from יבל or בול, but, according to the Assyrian, from *nabâlu*, to destroy, to waste, whence also *nabbaltu*, a hurricane. The Assyrian name of the Flood is *abûbu*.

wrath burst over their enemies. The article in בְּשָׁלוֹם is, as in *v.* 4, the generic article: He blesses His people with the full realization of His peace. How expressive in such a Psalm as this is the concluding word בְּשָׁלוֹם! It overarches it like a rainbow. The beginning of the Psalm shows us the heavens open, and the throne of God in the midst of the angelic songs of praise, and the conclusion of it shows us, upon the earth and in the midst of Jahve's voice of wrath as it shakes all things, His people victorious and blessed with peace.[1] *Gloria in excelsis* is the beginning, and *pax in terris* the close.

PSALM XXX.

A PSALM OF THANKSGIVING AFTER RECOVERY FROM DANGEROUS SICKNESS.

2 I extol Thee, Jahve, for Thou hast raised me up,
And hast not made mine enemies to rejoice over me.
3 Jahve, my God, I cried unto Thee, then Thou healedst me.
4 Jahve, Thou hast brought up my soul from Hades,
Thou hast revived me, so that I should not go down to the pit.

5 Sing unto Jahve, ye His saints,
And give thanks to His holy memorial.
6 For His anger is but momentary, His favour is life-long;
Weeping cometh to lodge in the evening,
And lo, there is exultation in the morning.

7 But as for me, I thought in my security:
"I shall not be moved for ever."
8 Jahve, in Thy favour Thou hadst given strength to my mountain;
Thou hast hidden Thy face, I was confounded.

9 Unto Thee, Jahve, did I cry,
And unto the Lord did I make supplication:

[1] The Holy One, blessed be He—says the Mischna, *Ukzin*, iii. 12, with reference to this passage—has found no other vessel (כְּלִי) to hold the blessing destined for Israel save peace.

10 "What profit is there in my blood, in my going down to the pit?
Shall the dust praise Thee? shall it declare Thy truth?
Hear, Jahve, and be gracious unto me!
Jahve, be Thou my Helper!"

12 Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing,
Thou hast loosed my sackcloth, and didst gird me with gladness,
13 So that my glory might sing of Thee without ceasing.
Jahve, my God, for ever will I praise Thee.

The summons to praise God, which in Ps. xxix. is addressed to the angels above, is here in Ps. xxx. directed to the pious below. There is nothing to be said against the לדוד. Here again Hitzig finds all kinds of indications of Jeremiah, but the parallels in Jeremiah are echoes of the Psalms, and דִּלִּיתַנִי (*v.* 2) implies no sort of lowering into a cistern or dungeon; it is rather a figurative expression for a lifting up out of the depths of suffering. Even the song of thanksgiving by Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii.) has grown out of the two concluding strophes of this Psalm, under the influence of an intimate knowledge of the Book of Job. We may therefore assume that it is David who, having been brought to the brink of the grave, while his kingdom was being established, now as one rescued praises the Lord, to whom, roused from his carnal security, he had fled, and calls upon all the pious to join with him. The Psalm bears the inscription: "*A Song-Psalm, at the dedication of the house, by David* (LXX., Aq., Sym., τῷ Δαυίδ). We here first meet with שִׁיר as a technical name in a title. Fleischer compares שִׁיר with שֵׂיר, a strip, a string, so that the song gets this name from the fact that the thoughts and words go on in one line (cf. نظم, חָרוּז). But perhaps שׁוּר (שִׁיר) is an onomatopoetic word, like זָמַר (זִמֵּר), whence the definitive מִזְמוֹר which is here joined with שִׁיר to fix its precise meaning: a song-psalm, *i.e.* a musical piece which is to be rendered with the accompaniment of the voice. The two following genitives חֲנֻכַּת הַבַּיִת have been

referred to the consecration of the site of the future temple (2 Sam. xxiv.; 1 Chron. xxi.); but although the place for the future temple, with the altar that had previously been erected on it, may be called בֵּית ה׳ (1 Chron. xxii. 1), and perhaps even simply הַבַּיִת (just as the temple hill was called הר הבית), yet we know, that David did not himself suffer from the pestilence, which followed as a punishment on the numbering of the people ordered by him in a spirit of arrogant self-glorification (2 Sam. xxiv. 17). But there is nothing in the Psalm to point to the consecration of any holy place, whether the mount of Moriah or the tent-temple (2 Sam. vi. 17). We might rather refer it to the re-consecration of the palace on David's return, after it had been polluted by Absalom; but the Psalm speaks of an imminent peril from which he had been graciously delivered, not by the removal of bloodthirsty enemies, but by recovery from a deadly sickness. It is therefore the consecration of the recently built fortress on Zion which is meant. That David regarded this building as a pledge of the security and greatness of his kingdom is shown by 2 Sam. v. 12, and in order to understand the Psalm we have, with Aben Ezra, Flam., Crus., Vaih., to infer, from indications given in the Psalm itself, that David had been delayed by a severe sickness from occupying the new building. The situation of Ps. xvi. is similar. That הבית, used thus absolutely, may denote the palace just as well as the temple is shown by the standing official title אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַבַּיִת (major-domo). In the Jewish ritual Ps. xxx., as even the tractate *Sofrim*, c. 18, § 2, states, is certainly the Psalm for the Feast of *Chanucca* or Dedication, which refers back to 1 Macc. iv. 52 *ff.*

Ver. 2–4. The Psalm begins like a hymn. The *Pi.* דִּלָּה (from דֶּלֶה, Arab. دلع, to hold anything long, limp and pendulous, whether upwards or downwards, Conj. v., تدلّى to dangle) means to lift, or draw up, like a bucket (דְּלִי,

Greek ἀντλίον, Lat. *tollo*, *tolleno*, in Festus). What the depth is into which he had sunk, and from which God has drawn him without allowing his enemies to rejoice because of him (לִי, as in xxv. 2), *i.e.* without granting them the malicious joy they desired, the poet himself tells: he had gone down as it were to Hades in consequence of a deadly disease. חִיָּה (never: to call from nothing into life) always means, to revive something which has apparently or really succumbed to death, or to preserve some living creature in life. With this is easily and satisfactorily connected the *Kerî* מִיַּרְדִי בוֹר, *ita ut non descenderem*; the inf. of יָרַד is here, after the analogy of the strong verb, יָרֹד, like יָבֹשׁ, יָשׁוֹן, and with the suffix *jordi* (like *josdi*, Job xxxviii. 4) or *jārʾdi*, for this and not *jordi* is to be read here (*vid.* on xvi. 1, lxxxvi. 2).[1] The *Chethîb* מיורדי might also be an infinitive written with *Cholem plenum*, just as an infinitive (Gen. xxxii. 20) and an imperative (Num. xxiii. 8) are punctuated with a *Cholem* instead of a *Kametz Chatuf*, but probably it ought to be read as a participle מְיוֹרְדִי: Thou hast revived me from among those sinking down into the pit (xxviii. 21), or from the condition of such (cf. xxii. 22*b*)—a pregnant construction quite unobjectionable (König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 411*f.*).

Vers. 5, 6. A summons to all pious ones to praise such a God, who, after a short time of anger, is gracious immediately and for a whole lifetime. Instead of Jahve's שֵׁם, it is זֵכֶר which is here used, as in xcvii. 12, after Ex. iii. 15: Jahve, as He reveals Himself, makes for Himself not only a name but also a memorial, and that in a glorious way. The history of redemption, as the unfolding of Jahve's name, is at the same time the setting up of a monument, the establishing of

[1] The Masora does not connect the word with אלין תיבותא יתירין וי״ו וחטפין קמצין (Introduction, 28 *b*), as we should expect, if the reading were *mijordi*; nor does it proceed on the supposition that *mijārdi* is a *participle* (Ew., p. 533), but that it is an *infin.* like עֲמָדֵךְ (read *ámādcha*), Obad. *v.* 11.

a memorial, and in fact the erecting of a זֵכֶר קָדְשׁוֹ, because all self-attestations of God, whether in love or in anger, proceed from the boundless light of His holiness. In the attestation of Himself to His own, love rules, and His anger towards them is but a vanishing moment (רֶגַע, as Schultens explains it: *vibramen*, a movement, viz. of the eye): *a moment passes in His anger, a* (whole) *life in His favour, i.e.* the former lasts only a moment, the latter the whole life of a man. "*Alles Ding währt seine Zeit, Gottes Lieb in Ewigkeit*" (everything lasts its time, God's love is for ever). The preposition בְּ does not indicate here, as in the beautiful parallel passage, Isa. liv. 7*f.* (cf. lx. 10), the time and mode in which a thing happens, but the condition in which one passes the time. *V.* 6 *b c* describes how quickly love withdraws the wrath (cf. Isa. xvii. 14): weeping puts up with us in the evening in order to remain over night, but in the morning another guest, like a rescuing angel, viz. רִנָּה, appears, before whom בְּכִי disappears. The predicate, יָלִין, does not also belong to 6 *c* (Hupf., Hitz.). The noun clause: and in the morning joy = joy is present, depicts the suddenness and the surprise of the help of Him who sends both בכי and רנה.

Vers. 7, 8. David now relates his experience more in detail, and first of all the cause of the chastisement he has undergone. With that earlier self-confidence of his, in which (like the רשע, x. 6) he had believed himself immovable, he now, in וַאֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי, contrasts the confidence in God, which he had gained in the school of affliction. Instead of trusting in the giver, he had trusted in the gift, as though it had been his own doing. It is uncertain—though it comes to the same thing—whether שַׁלְוִי is the inflected infinitive, שָׁלְוִי, of the verb שָׁלַו (according to our translation), or the inflected noun שַׁלְוִי = שַׁלְוֵנִי (after the form of שָׂחִי, swimming, for forms like שָׂחְיִי are avoided in Hebrew), the same in signification as שַׁלְוָה (Jer. xxii. 21). Such fleshly confidence, as it is more minutely described in Deut. viii. 11–18, has some

humbling, divine chastisement as its unavoidable result. This close connection is expressed by the perfects, *v.* 8, which put the favour of God, the withdrawal of that favour occasioned by self-exaltation, and the suprise that undeceived him, all upon the same level as regards time. הֶעֱמִיד עֹז, to set up strength, is equivalent to, to give it as a firm possession; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 8, which passage is a varied but not a corrupt repetition (Riehm) of 2 Kings xxi. 8. It is, therefore, unnecessary with Hitz. (cf. his commentary on Job xi. 6 *b*), to regard לְ as an accusative and עֹז as an adverb: in Thy favour hadst Thou made my mountain to stand firmly. The LXX., Jer., Syr. read להדרי, *decori meo*. But the hill is Zion, strong by nature and by art (2 Sam. v. 9), and this as the castle-hill is an emblem of David's kingdom: Jahve had made his kingdom strong to David, when on account of his self-confidence He made him to feel, how he is everything only through Him, and without Him absolutely nothing. The inflexional form הָרְרִי instead of הָרִי = *harri* is supported by Gen. xiv. 6 and Jer. xvii. 3 (where it is הָרָי as from הָרָר). The above cited reading להדרי, *i.e.* to my royal dignity, is a happy *quid pro quo*, on the other hand the reading of the Targum להררי: "placed (me) on strong hills," would require the conjecture, הֶעֱמַדְתַּנִי (Riehm), which commends itself rather than Dillmann's העמדת לי הררי עז, which is a too objective employment of this metaphor.

Vers. 9–11. Yet he, who had been thus chastened, prayed earnestly. In *v.* 9 the imperfects standing in the flow of the narrative have the signification of the "present in the past," as the Arabs say. In *v.* 9 *b* we must read ואל־אֲדֹנָי: as this passage belongs to the ק״ל ואדין, *i.e.* the 134 passages where אדני has not only to be read instead of יהוה, but is actually written (*cid.* xc. 17. cxxx. 7). From the question: "what (which, what sort of) profit (the ordinary expression for τί ὄφελος, *quid lucri*) is in my blood," it does not follow, that David was in danger of death at the hand of enemies, for

ותרפאני, *v.* 3, teaches us something different: "what profit would there be in my blood," is therefore equivalent to (cf. Job xvi. 18), what advantage would there be in this, that Thou violently slayest me before the time? On the contrary, God would but rob Himself of the praises, which the living would bring, would even gladly bring Him. His prayer for prolonged life was not offered therefore with the view of any earthly possession or enjoyment, but only with a view to the honour of God. He dreaded death as being an end of praise to God. For no Psalms are sung beyond the grave (vi. 6). In the Old Testament, Hades was not yet overcome, heaven was not yet opened. The בני אלים are in heaven, but not yet blessed בני אדם.

Vers. 12, 13. In order to express the unfailing result of his prayer and its fulfilment, the elsewhere (*vid. e.g.* xxxii. 5) customary conjunctive ו is omitted; with "הָפַכְתָּ וגו compare the echoes in Jer. xxxi. 3, Lam. v. 15. We are, according to our historical interpretation, as little to think of 2 Sam. vi. 14 on account of מְחוֹל, as of 1 Chron. xxi. 16 on account of יַשְׁקִי. In place of the garments of penitence and sorrow (cf. מַחֲגֹרֶת שָׂק, Isa. iii. 24), slung round his body (fastened perhaps only with a string), came a girding round (אֵזֹר syn. חָגַר lxv. 13, whence חֲגֹרָה, אֵזוֹר) with gladness. The intended result of so speedy and thorough a change in his affliction, after it had wholesomely humbled him, was Jahve's praise: that the glory (כָּבוֹד instead of כְּבוֹדִי = נַפְשִׁי as in vii. 6, xvi. 9, cvii. 2; Grätz on the other hand reads כִּנּוֹרִי) may sing Thy praises, without ceasing (יְזַמֵּר *impf. Kal*). And the praise of Jahve for ever is also his determination, as this Psalm vows, and at the same time carries it out.

PSALM XXXI.

THE SELF-SURRENDER INTO GOD'S HAND OF ONE CRUELLY PERSECUTED.

2 In Thee, Jahve, have I hid myself—
I shall never be put to shame,
In Thy righteousness deliver me.
3 Incline Thine ear unto me, deliver me speedily;
Be Thou to me a rock of refuge,
A fortified house, to save me.
4 For Thou art my rock and my fortress,
And for Thy name's sake Thou wilt lead and guide me.
5 Thou wilt draw me out of the net they have privily laid for me,
For Thou art my defence.
6 Into Thy hand I commend my spirit,
Thou redeemest me, Jahve, God of truth!
7 Hateful to me are the worshippers of vain idols;
But as for me, I cleave to Jahve.
8 I will exult and be glad in Thy grace,
For Thou hast looked upon my misery,
Hast taken knowledge of the needs of my soul.
9 And Thou hast not shut me up in the hand of the enemy,
Thou hast set my feet in a broad place.

10 Be gracious unto me, Jahve, for I am straitened,
Consumed with grief is mine eye and soul and body.
11 For spent is my life with sorrow,
And my years with sighing,
My strength is broken down by means of mine iniquity,
And my bones are fallen away.
12 Because of all mine adversaries, I am become a reproach,
And to my neighbours a burden, and a terror to my friends;
They that see me without, flee from me.
13 I am forgotten, like a dead man, out of mind,
I am become like a vessel left to perish.
14 For I hear the whispering of many,
Terror on every side;
When they take counsel together against me—
They devise how to take away my life.

15 But I—in Thee do I trust, Jahve,
I say: my God art Thou.

16 In Thy hand are my times,
Deliver me out of the hand of mine enemies, and from my persecutors!
17 Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servant,
Save me in Thy mercy.
18 Jahve, I shall not be shamed, for I call on Thee;
The ungodly shall be shamed, silent in Hades.
19 Lying lips must be mute,
Which speak insolently of the righteous,
In pride and contempt.

20 How great is Thy goodness, which Thou hast reserved for them that fear Thee,
Which Thou dost perform for them that hide in Thee before the sons of men.
21 Thou shelterest them in the shelter of Thy countenance from the factions of the people,
Thou keepest them in a pavilion from the strife of tongues.
22 Blessed be Jahve,
For He hath shown wonderful love to me in a strong city.
23 I indeed said in mine alarm:
"I am cut off from the sphere of Thine eyes."
Yet Thou heardest the voice of my supplication when I cried unto Thee.
24 Love Jahve, all ye His saints:
Jahve preserveth faithfulness
And recompenseth richly him that practiseth pride.
25 Be strong, and let your heart gather courage,
All ye who wait for Jahve!

In Ps. xxxi. too, the author looks back, *v.* 23, with וַאֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי, to a previous state of mind, one viz. of conflict, just as in xxx. 7 he did to one of security; here also he shares with all חֲסִידִים the wholesome fruit of his deliverance (cf. xxxi. 14 with xxx. 5). The situation of the two Psalms is in other respects, however, very different. Both are by David. Hitz., however, holds both to be by Jeremiah. In reference to Ps. xxxi., which Ewald also ascribes to Jeremiah, this opinion is well worthy of attention. Not only does *v.* 14 *a* occur again in Jer. xx. 10, but the whole Psalm, by its language (cf. *e.g.* *v.* 10 with Lam. i. 20; *v.* 11 with Jer. xx. 18; *v.* 18 with Jer.

xvii. 18; *v.* 23 with Lam. iii. 54), and by its plaintive tenderness, reminds us of Jeremiah. But these similarities are not decisive. The passage in Jer. xx. 10, like many other passages in this prophet, whose language is strongly imbued by that of the Psalter, may be not less a reminiscence than Jonah ii. 5, 9; and as regards the plaintive tenderness, there are no characters more nearly allied, both naturally and spiritually, than David and Jeremiah, who are both servants of Jahve, with noble tender souls, that were capable of deep feeling, full of longings for love, and enriched with experiences of sorrow. Though not without misgivings, we hold by the testimony of the title, and regard the Psalm as a song springing from the outward and inward conflict (LXX. ἐκστάσεως, apparently from a combination of *v.* 23, ἐν ἐκστάσει, בחפזי, with 1 Sam. xxvi. 26) of Saul's time. While *v.* 12*c* does not suit the mouth of Jeremiah, when he was imprisoned (Hitz.), the Psalm has not only much in common with Ps. lxix. (especially lxix. 9, 33), which seems to be by Jeremiah, but also with other Psalms which we regard as Davidic: the figures, which correspond to David's warlike life at that time, under rocks and in caves of the wilderness; the encouraging exhortation, xxxi. 25; cf. xxii. 27, xxvii. 14; the rare use of the *Hiph.* הִפְלִיא, xxxi. 22, xvii. 7; the longing to be hid by God, xxxi. 21; cf. xvii. 8, lxiv. 3, and much else. It has this in common with Ps. xxii. that Christ on the cross took from it His last words, as He took from the latter His third last utterance. But the prefigurement of the Passion keeps in xxxi. 10–14 within the limits of the type, and gets no prophetic enhancement similar to that which takes place with regard to that unique Ps. xxii., with which only Ps. lxix. can be compared. The beginning, *vv.* 2–4, is repeated in Ps. lxxi., which consists of centos from other Psalms by some younger unknown poet, just as *v.* 23 is partially found in cxvi. 11. The arrangement of strophes is not very clear.

Vers. 2–9. The poet begins with a prayer for deliverance which is grounded on the confidence, which Jahve, to whom he commits himself, never can disappoint; and rejoices beforehand in the security he anticipates without a doubt. From the fact of his being hidden in God (חָסִיתִי) springs the confident certainty, that neither now nor ever can it come to pass with him, that he will be ashamed, that his hope will disappoint him. On this basis rests the supplicatory פַּלְּטֵנִי, which appeals to the righteousness of God, which cannot but answer conduct, that has been conformable to the institution of salvation, with the saving manifestations longed for, even though it may be only after long trial. In *c.* 3 *ff.* the prayer is shaped to suit the condition of one chased by Saul hither and thither among the mountains and in the wilderness, homeless and shelterless. In the phrase צוּר מָעוֹז, מָעוֹז is *gen. appositionis*: a rock of defence (מָעוֹז from עָזַז, as in xxvii. 1) or rather, of refuge (מָעוֹז = معاذ, from עוּז, עוֹז = عاذ, as in xxxvii. 39, lii. 9, and also perhaps Isa. xxx. 2, and elsewhere).[1] A rock-castle, *i.e.* a castle on a rock, would be termed מָעוֹז צוּר, reversing the order of the words. צוּר מָעוֹן in lxxi. 3, a rock of habitation, *i.e.* a rock which affords a safe sojourn. מְצוּדָה (properly *specula*, a place whence one can see far and wide) means a mountain height, or a mountain summit; a house on a mountain height is a house placed on the top of a high hill guaranteeing a secure refuge (*vid.* on

[1] عاذ, عوذ, also means, like חָסָה, whose parallel word it is in Isa. xxx. 2, to hide somewhere (*Pi.* and *Hi.*, Hebrew הֵעִיז, according to Kamus, Zamachschari and Nešwân: to hide any one, *e.g.* Koran iii. 21), whence عَايِذ, a plant growing among bushes (*bên eš-šôk*, according to Kamus) or in crevices of the rocks (*fi-l-ḥazn*, according to Nešwân), inaccessible to the flocks; عُوَّذ, gazelles that are invisible, *i.e.* keep themselves hid for seven days, after giving birth, also used of pieces of flesh of which the flesh is hidden among the bones; عُوذَة, an amulet with which a man covers (*protegit*) himself, etc., *Wetzstein*.

xviii. 3). The thought: show me Thy salvation, for Thou art my Saviour, underlies what is introduced by כִּי, *vv.* 4 and 5 *b*. Köster considers this to be illogical, but it is the logic of all believing prayer. The poet prays that God would be to him *actu reflexo*, what He even now is to the *actus directus* of his faith. The imperfects in *vv.* 4 and 5 express expectations, which necessarily spring out of what Jahve is to the poet. The interchangeable terms, הַנְחֵה and נַהֵל, already familiar to us from Ps. xxiii., stand near to each other, in order to express the extreme urgency of the longing for the gentle and safe guidance of God's grace. Instead of translating "out of the net, which . . .," according to the accents it should be (cf. x. 2, xii. 8) "out of the net there . . .," so that טָמְנוּ לִי is a relative clause without a relative. The evidence for the text in 5 *b* wavers between יָעֲנוּנִי and יָעִיזוּנִי (Kimchi), just as in xliii. 2 (cf. what is said on 2 Sam. xxii. 33). Into the hand of this God, who is, and who will be all this to him, he commits his spirit; he hands it over into His hand as a trust, or deposit (פִּקָּדוֹן), for what is deposited there is safely laid up, and removed from all danger and from all need. It is not נַפְשִׁי which is used, though Theodoret substitutes that: *τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ ψυχὴν τῇ σῇ παρατίθημι προμηθείᾳ*, but רוּחִי, and that too intentionally; the prayer lays hold of life by its very root, as that root springs directly from God, and as it also lives in the believer from God and in God, and it places this life under the protection of Him, who is the true life of all spirit-life (Isa. xxxviii. 16), and of all life. It is the word of prayer with which Christ, when dying, breathes out His life (Luke xxiii. 46). The time of persecution by Saul was the richest in types of the Passion, and this word of prayer, that comes from David when in that furnace of affliction, marks in Christ's mouth a crisis in the history of redemption, which fulfils the Old Testament. Like David He commends his spirit-life to God, not however that He may not die, but that dying He may not die, *i.e.* that He may receive again His

psychico-corporeal life, which is hid in God's hand, in imperishable power and glory. What is so earnestly hoped for appears to the faith, which commits itself to God, to be as good as already done: "Thou hast redeemed me, Jahve, God of truth." The *perf.* פָּדִיתָה, is not here, as in iv. 2, used of what is past, but of what is already as good as past; it is not supplicatory (Ew., § 223 *b*), but like the perfects in *vv.* 8, 9, the expression of believing anticipation of redemption, it is the *præt. confidentiæ* which is closely allied to the *præt. proph.*; for the spirit of faith, like the spirit of the prophets, speaks of the future with historical certainty. From the idea of אֵל אֱמֶת, the reference to false gods implied in אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת (2 Chron. xv. 3), cannot be excluded, since the "vain illusions," *v.* 7, are put in antithesis; ever since Deut. xxxii. 21 הַבְלִים is a favourite name for idols, and especially in Jeremiah (*e.g.* viii. 19). On the other hand, according to the connection it cannot be very different from אֵל אֱמוּנָה, Deut. xxxii. 4, since the idea of God as a trustee is not yet lost sight of, and elsewhere too אֱמֶת and אֱמוּנָה are used interchangeably, as personal attributes: אֱמֶת is being which abides and verifies itself; אֱמוּנָה is mind which abides and verifies itself. Therefore אֵל אֱמֶת is the God, who, as the true God, by a living rule preserves the truth of His revelation, and especially of His promises.

In *v.* 7 David appeals to his sincere surrender of himself to this true and faithful God; those who worship false gods are hateful to him, while he, on the other hand, clings to Jahve; the idols are called הַבְלֵי־שָׁוְא, as being of no use to their worshippers—they are but delusive beings, without any real existence. We ought probably (as *v.* 6) to read שָׂנֵאתָ, with the LXX., Vulg., Syr., Aram. (Hitz., Ew., Olsh., Riehm and others); in the present text, which shows no corrective *Kerî* such as we have in 2 Sam. xiv. 21, Ruth iv. 5, ואני is not an antithesis to the foregoing sentence, but only to a member of it. In Jonah's (ii. 9) Psalm we find מְשַׁמְּרִים

הַבְלֵי־שָׁוְא; here the *Kal* is used in the sense of *observare, colere*, as in Hos. iv. 10 and also Prov. xxvii. 18: in the waiting service there is involved, as lix. 10 shows, the waiting confidence. בָּטַח, which denotes the *fiducia fidei*, is elsewhere construed with בְּ of adhering to, or עַל of resting upon, here with אֶל of hanging on. The cohortatives in *v.* 8 express intentions; Olsh. and Hupf. translate them as optatives: would that I could rejoice; but, as a continuation of *v.* 7, that appears to be less appropriate. Sure of being heard, he resolves to give expression to his grateful joy for Jahve's grace, because He has (אָשַׁר, as in Gen. xxxiv. 27) looked upon (ἐπέβλεψε, Luke i. 48) his sorrow, because He has known and exerted Himself for his soul's needs. In view of Gen. xix. 33, 35, Job xii. 9, xxxv. 15, the construction יָדַע בְּ cannot be objected to (Hupf., in the translation prefixed to his exposition); it is more significant than our "to know about a thing." בְּ, like ἐπί in ἐπιγιγνώσκειν, is used of the full knowledge which grasps the object and makes itself master of it (apperception). הִסְגִּיר, *v.* 9, συγκλείειν, as in 1 Sam. xxiii. 11 (in David's mouth): so to give up, that the hand of the other closes round what is given up, *i.e.* has it absolutely in its power. מְרָחֹב as in xviii. 20, cf. xxvi. 12. It is David's language, in which the Thora, and especially Deuteronomy (xxxii. 30, cf. xxiii. 16), is re-echoed.

Vers. 10–14. After the pæan sung in the fulness of faith before the victory, prayer begins again in this second portion of the Psalm (in strophes of diminishing size: 6, 5, 4); this prayer is grounded on the greatness of his suffering, which the Psalmist, after strengthening himself in his confidence on God, now sets before Him all the more comprehensively. צַר־לִי, *angustum est mihi*, as lxix. 18, cf. xviii. 7. 10*b* runs word for word like vi. 8, only that to עֵינִי, the eye, which mirrors the condition of passivity, and in which the sensuous perception and objective impressionableness of man are con-

centrated, there are here added נֶפֶשׁ, the soul which unites spirit and body, and בֶּטֶן (not cognate with the post-biblical בָּלַט, *protuberare*, but, on the contrary, from a root בט, which signifies a cavity, which enlarges inwardly, *vid.* on xvii. 14), the inward parts of the body, which reflect the psychico-spiritual activities and feelings. With חַיִּים, with which is associated the idea of the organic intermingling of the powers of soul and body, the predicate is, as in lxxxviii. 4, connected in the plural. That the poet should name his guilt as that by which his physical powers had been weakened (כָּשַׁל, as Neh. iv. 4), cannot appear strange even in a Psalm belonging to the time of Saul's persecution, for the longer this lasted the more deeply must David have felt that he needed this furnace of affliction. The text used by the LXX. in 12*ab* was exactly the same as ours: *παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου ἐγενήθην ὄνειδος, καὶ τοῖς γείτοσί μου σφόδρα καὶ φόβος τοῖς γνωστοῖς μου.* But this *σφόδρα* (Jerome, *nimis*) would be tolerable only, if we might translate: become a reproach also (even) to my neighbours very much—for this position of מְאֹד one might then compare Jud. xii. 2; and this translation is not impossible, for וְ not only has frequently the sense of "also," as 2 Sam. i. 23, but (apart from passages in which it may be translated "and that," as taking up something which had been omitted, as Amos iv. 10 and Isa. x. 15, according to the reading וְאֶת־מְרִימָיו) it sometimes has this very meaning (like *καί*, *et* = *etiam*), Isa. xxxii. 7, Hos. viii. 6 (according to the accents), 2 Chron. xxvii. 5, Cant. v. 6 (cf. Ew., § 352*b*). Yet since this was not a usage fully recognized in Hebrew, but one only coming to be recognized, the question occurs whether we cannot perhaps reach our end without making וְ = גַּם, which is always a doubtful meaning. Olsh. puts וּלְשֹׁכְנַי after לִמְיֻדָּעָי, whereby all difficulty is, no doubt, set aside. Hitz. changes מְאֹד into מָגֹר, frightened, scared. But one naturally expects a substantive parallel to חֶרְפָּה, such as "terror" (Syr.), according to which Krochmal has מָגוֹר,

Grätz מָאוֹם, or "burden." May not מאד be perhaps equivalent to מִשְׂאת? J. D. Michaelis compared the Arabic أود (أودغ) in the sense of *onus*; we may, without the scruples of Maurer and Hupfeld, assume that מאד (it is better to read מְאֹד than מְאֹד) has here just this signification. For אוד, آد, has the radical signification: to be compressed, compact, firm and solid, from which are derived the significations apportioned to *âda jaûdu* and *âda jaûdu*, to be strong, powerful, and to press upon, to burden (intr. *awida*, to be burdened, to bend under pressure), which significations اد unites in itself (cf. on xx. 9).[1] The number of the enemies, whom David had, ultimately procured for him, even in the eyes of the better disposed, the reproach of being a usurper and rebel; those with whom he found friendly shelter began by degrees to feel themselves burdened, because brought into danger; and how much reason, humanly speaking, not only those who knew him but slightly, but even those who knew him intimately (מְיֻדָּעִים, as lv. 14, lxxxviii. 9, 19), had for avoiding all intercourse with him, is shown by the sorrowful fate of Abimelech and the other priests at Nob. He is thus like one dead, whom people, when once he has been carried from his house to the grave, are wont in general to put out of mind (נִשְׁכַּח מִלֵּב, *oblivione exstingui ex corde*, cf. מִפֶּה, Deut. xxxi. 21); all intimate intercourse with him is, as it were, cut off, he has become כְּכְלִי אֹבֵד, which, taking into account the reason which follows, *v.* 14, does not mean *vas perditum*, but *vas periens*, a vessel in the act of אָבַד, *i.e.* set aside or thrown away, which one no more troubles one's self about, but leaves to perish utterly (cf. Hos. viii. 8 with Jer. xlviii. 38 and Jer. xxii. 28). With כִּי he gives the reason of this comparison of himself to a household vessel that has become useless.

[1] Whether מְאֹד, *σφόδρα*, is to be traced back to אוד, we here leave undecided. The Assyrian has a verb מאד, to be much, whence *mâ'idu*, *ma'du*, much; *mu'du*, *ma'dûtu*, a multitude, fulness.

Whisperings and slanders of many brand him as a transgressor, terror surrounds him on every side (word for word as Jer. xx. 10, where the prophet, with whom מָגוֹר מִסָּבִיב is also elsewhere a common standing formula, in a similar position uses the language of the Psalmist); when they sit together to consult about him (according to the accents the second half of the verse begins with בְּהִוָּסְדָם), they think of nothing else but to get rid of him. If the construction of ב with its infinitive were to be continued in *v.* 14*d*, then it would be וְזָמְמוּ לקחת נפשי or לקחת נפשי יָזֹמּוּ. With לָקַח נֶפֶשׁ, to take life, cf. 1 Kings xix. 10, Prov. i. 19.

Vers. 15–19. But although a curse of the world and the offscouring of all people, he trusts in God, his deliverer and avenger. As in *v.* 7, the subject is by וַאֲנִי set forth prominently by way of contrast. It seems as though Jahve had given him up in anger, but he trusts in Him, and in spite of this appearance he prays to Him with the words of appropriating faith. עִתּוֹת or עִתִּים (1 Chron. xxix. 30) are the determined events and circumstances of the time, the changes of human life, like the Arab. *auḳât*, the times and at the same time that which exists and happens in them; the multiplicity of the times, with the manifoldness of what they contain (v. Orelli, *Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit*, p. 50), are in the hand of the Lord, all fates are by His appointment. Vulg.: *in manibus tuis sortes meæ*, after the LXX.: *οἱ κλῆροί μου*, for which it is true, according to the Itala, *καιροί* is the original. From this consciousness, that God's almighty and faithful hand shapes his life, spring the petitions of *v.* 16*b*, 17. There are three of these; the central one is an echo of the blessing of Aaron (Num. vi. 25). The words כִּי קְרָאתִיךָ, which ground the hope that he will not be put to shame (cf. *v.* 2), have to be understood, like אָמַרְתִּי, *v.* 15, according to Ges., § 126, 3. The ground given favours our taking אַל־אֵבוֹשָׁה not so much optatively (may I not be put to shame) as expressing a hope. The imperfects follow-

ing might nevertheless be optatives, but the position of the words does not require that; we regard them also as expressing hopes, so that to the three petitions in *v.* 16, 17 correspond the three hopes in *v.* 18, 19: he will not be put to shame, but transgressors shall be put to shame, and shall be silenced for ever. The form יִדְמוּ, from דָּמַם, is, as in Jer. viii. 14, the plural of the impf. *Kal* יִדֹּם with the doubling of the first letter of the root, common in Aramaic (such as, besides, יִקֹּד, יִשֹּׁם, יִתֹּם), but it may be also the *impf. Ni.* instead of יִדָּמוּ (1 Sam. ii. 9) or יִדֹּמוּ (Jer. xlviii. 2), with the doubling removed, like נָבְקָה (Isa. xix. 3) instead of נָבֻקָה; the לִשְׁאוֹל connected with it favours the passive construction: they shall be silenced to Hades, *i.e.* falling a prey to Hades. Like דָּמַם, נֶאֱלָם (*v.* 19) here, according to the context, means a forcible suffering through the judicial intervention of God: all lying lips shall be silenced, *i.e.* made dumb. עָתָק, properly that which is unrestrained, free, insolent (cf. Arab. *ʿâtik*, *ʿatîk*, unrestrained, free),[1] is the accusative of the object, as in xciv. 4, and the nominative of the subject in 1 Sam. ii. 3.

Vers. 20–25. In this part well-grounded hope becomes triumphant certainty, and this breaks forth into grateful praise of God's goodness towards His own and into glad exhortation of all to wait on Jahve in stedfast faith. The thought, how gracious has God shown Himself to me, appears in *v.* 20 in a more general form. It is an exclamation of adoring admiration (מָה, as xxxvi. 8). טוּב ה׳ is the sum of goodness which God has treasured up for His own, for their abiding and increasing enjoyment. צָפַן is used in no other signification than xvii. 14 (cf. *τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον*, Rev. ii. 17). Instead of פָּעַלְתָּ, it ought strictly to have been צָפַנְתָּ, as one may say צָפַן טוּב but not פָּעַל טוּב; what is meant is the proving or manifesting of טוּב out of that טוּב which is the

[1] But these Arabic words do not pass over into the signification of "insolent."

storehouse of grace. Jahve thus acknowledges His own to the confusion of their enemies, and in spite of all the world (xxiii. 5). He takes His own under His protection, from the רִכְסֵי אִישׁ, conspiracies of men, from the wrangling, *i.e.* the slanderous scourging, of tongues. Whether רִכְסֵי (from רָכַם) signifies bands of people (Targ. גְּדוּדֵי), or, actively: conspiracies (Raschi), is doubtful; but the root in any case is רכם, signifying "to combine" (according to which Jefeth: *a vinculis hominis*). This meaning is common in Arab. and Assyr.,[1] and is guaranteed to Hebrew also by Ex. xxviii. 28, xxxix. 21. The meaning *evertere*, which is connected with this root in Arabic (*vid.* Koran iv. 90) and in the Talmud, has to be set aside even on this ground, that it cannot be proved to be equally ancient. In other passages it is said, that God hides men in סֵתֶר אָהֳלוֹ (xxvii. 5), or in סֵתֶר כְּנָפָיו (lxi. 5), or in His shadow, צֵל (xci. 1); here it is: in the defence and covert of His countenance, *i.e.* in the region of that unapproachable light which streams from His countenance. The סֻכָּה is the intimate protection of the Almighty, which overcanopies the persecuted one, like a canopy of leaves. With בָּרוּךְ ה׳ David passes over again to his personal experience. The unity of the Psalm requires us to make the praise refer to the fact of deliverance, which is anticipated by faith. Jahve has shown wondrous grace to him, inasmuch as He has procured for him עִיר מָצוֹר as a place of abode. מָצוֹר, from צוּר, to shut in (Arab. *miṣr*, with the denominative verb *maṣṣara*, to found a fortified city), means both a siege, *i.e.* a shutting in by siege-works, and a fortification (cf. lx. 11, with cviii. 11), *i.e.* a shutting in by fortification works against the attacks of enemies (2 Chron. viii. 5). The strong city, it is generally explained, is God Himself, and His powerful and gracious protection. One might then com-

[1] רכם, in Assyrian, means to bind (whence *riksu*, a band, a cord, a rope); *Pi.* to put together, said of embankments and the like. In Isa. xl. 2, רכסים means rocky heights, where crag is piled on crag.

pare Isa. xxxiii. 11 and other passages. But why should not an actual city be meant, Ziklag namely? There David, after long years of wandering, found a secure asylum, but even in it he still needed deliverance—deliverance from the suspicious grip of the Philistines. He had already said (cf. cxvi. 11) in his anxious restlessness (חָפְזִי, *trepidatio*): I am cut off from the range of Thine eyes. נִגְרַזְתִּי, for which Lam. iii. 54 has נִגְזַרְתִּי, and Jon. ii. 5, נִגְרַשְׁתִּי, is not a mistake; even in Arab. جرز, like جزز, means to cut off, to exterminate. In his fear and despair he thought that God would trouble Himself about him no more; אָכֵן, *verum enim vero*, but Jahve heard his supplication, when he cried unto Him (same words as in xxviii. 2). On the ground of such experiences, he calls upon all the godly to love such a God, *i.e.* to love love itself. The plural אֱמוּנִים may be taken personally (from אֱמוּן, like עֲרוּךְ, Jon. ii. 5, from עָרוּךְ), but also abstractly, as Prov. xiii. 17 and often; the expression שֹׁמֵר אמונים (Isa. xxvi. 2), which is in sense closely allied to נֹצֵר אֱמוּנִים, decides in favour of the latter (Hengst., Hitz., Riehm). The contrast in the two members of 24 *b* is like that in Exod. xxxiv. 7. On the one hand God preserves the faithful, and so approves Himself as true to His promises; on the other hand, not scantily, but in abundant measure (עַל = *κατά*, as we say: in the richest way, cf. עַל-נְקֻלָּה, Jer. vi. 14, in the simplest way, the easiest), He recompenses those who practise pride—before God the Lord the sin of sins. An encouraging call to the godly (transformed from the usual חֲזַק וְיַאֲמֵץ, *macte esto*) concludes the Psalm; it is similar to the encouraging call to himself in xxvii. 14. The godly and the faithful are here called "those who wait on Jahve." They are to wait patiently, for this waiting has a glorious ending; the Easter sun at last breaks through the wrathful aspect of the heavens, and the *esto mihi* is changed into Hallelujah. This eye of hope patiently directed to Jahve is the peculiarity of Old Testament faith. But the essential unity of the Old Testament

institution of grace with that of the New Testament is set before us in Ps. xxxii., which, in its New Testament Pauline character, is the counterpart of Ps. xix.

PSALM XXXII.

THE WAY TO THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

1 Blessed is he whose transgression is taken away, whose sin is covered.
2 Blessed is the man, to whom Jahve reckoneth not iniquity,
And in whose spirit there is no guile.

3 When I kept silence, my bones rotted
Through my constant groaning.
4 For day and night Thy hand was heavy upon me,
My moisture was changed in summer's drought (*Selah*).
5 I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and my guilt I did not hide;
I said: "I will confess my transgressions unto Jahve,"—
And Thou, Thou hast taken away the guilt of my sin (*Selah*).

6 For this let every godly one pray unto Thee at a time when Thou mayest be found.
Assuredly, when great waters swell,
They shall not reach him.
7 Thou art my covert, from trouble wilt Thou protect me,
With songs of deliverance wilt Thou compass me about (*Selah*).

8 I will teach and instruct thee as to the way which thou must go;
I will counsel thee, keeping mine eye upon thee.
9 Be not like horses, like mules without understanding.
With bit and bridle, their harness, must one curb them,
Otherwise they come not near unto thee.
10 Many sorrows are to the ungodly,
But whosoever trusteth in Jahve, with grace He compasseth him about.

11 Be glad in Jahve, and exult, ye righteous,
And shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart!

There are several prominent marks by means of which this Psalm is coupled with the preceding one (*vid. Symbolæ*,

§ 52); in both, the Psalmist, with אָמַרְתִּי, refers back to a fact of his inner life, and both conclude with an exhortation to the godly, which is related to the whole as a sort of general inference. Otherwise the two Psalms are different: Ps. xxxi. is a supplicatory Psalm in circumstances of outward distress; Ps. xxxii. is a didactic Psalm as to the way repentance leads to forgiveness; it is the second of the Church's seven *Psalmi pœnitentiales*, and Augustine's favourite Psalm. We might give it as a motto Augustine's *intelligentia prima est ut te nôris peccatorem*. The poet draws from his own personal experience general lessons for the good of all in the Church. David was for a whole year, after his sin of adultery, like one condemned, in the utmost misery. Ps. li. was composed when in this misery; Ps. xxxii. was written, on the other hand, only after deliverance; the former in the midst of the penitential struggle, the latter after inward peace had been again attained. The theme of this Psalm is the rich treasures of knowledge, drawn from that abyss of inward need: the blessedness of forgiveness, the sincere, unreserved confession of sin as the way to it, and the protection of God amid all dangers, as well as joy in God, as its fruits.

Accordingly, מַשְׂכִּיל, in the signification, *Psalmus didascalicus s. informatorius* (Reuchlin: *ut si liceret dicere intellectificum vel resipiscentificum*), would be as suitable a name as possible for this Psalm, which teaches the way of salvation. But this signification of the word is inadmissible. If for no other reason than that the *Hiph.* הִשְׂכִּיל occurs in Hebrew only in isolated cases before the exile (*v.* 8, Prov. xxi. 11) with the causative signification, to make intelligent, and becomes common in this sense only in the later writers (Dan., Chron., Neh.), it is not likely that מַשְׂכִּיל, which elsewhere always means *intelligens*, should as a technical term mean *intelligentem faciens*. But what is decisive against the meaning, "a didactic poem," is this, that, of the thirteen

Psalms which are inscribed מַשְׂכִּיל, only two (xxxii. and lxxviii.) can be regarded as didactic poems; Ps. xlv. is also called שִׁיר יְדִידֹת, and Ps. cxlii. תְּפִלָּה, two names, which ill accord with didactic purpose and plan. And xlvii. 8, a passage of great importance for determining the meaning of the word, in which מַשְׂכִּיל is used as an objective accusative, excludes the meaning, didactic poem. Ewald remarks (*Dichter des A. B.*, i. 31, cf. Riehm *in loc.*), "we have in Ps. xlvii. 8 the surest guide to the correct meaning of the word; here מַשְׂכִּיל stands along with זַמֵּר as a more accurate designation of the singing, and there can be no doubt that an *intelligent*, melodious song must be equivalent to an *elegant*, artistically composed one." But מַשְׂכִּיל is always used elsewhere as an attribute of persons, because what is so called is not what is made intelligently, but what is itself intelligent. Even in 2 Chron. xxx. 22, where reference is made to the *Maskil* Psalms, it is the Levite musicians themselves who are called (שֵׂכֶל טוֹב) הַמַּשְׂכִּילִים (*i.e.* those who with fine tact perform skilfully). Thus we are driven to the *Hiphil* meaning of thoughtful meditation (cvi. 7; cf. xli. 2, Prov. xvi. 20), so that מַשְׂכִּיל means that which meditates, then meditation, just as מַכְבִּיר is that which multiplies, and then fulness, מַשְׁחִית, that which destroys, and then destruction. Nothing can be discovered from the *Maskil* Psalms themselves, as *e.g.* liv. and cxlii., as to any special technical meaning of the word. It means then nothing but *pia meditatio*.

Vers. 1, 2. The Psalm begins by speaking of the blessedness of the man who experiences God's justifying grace, when he gives himself up unreservedly to Him. Sin is called פֶּשַׁע, as a breaking away from God; חַטָּאָה, as a deviation from what is well-pleasing to God; עָוֹן, as a perversion, a distortion, a misdeed. The forgiveness of sin is called נָשָׂא (Ex. xxxiv. 7, Isa. liii. 4), as being a lifting up and a taking away, αἴρειν and ἀφαιρεῖν; כָּסָה (lxxxv. 3, Prov. x. 12,

Neh. iii. 37), as being a covering, so that it becomes invisible to God, the Holy One, and is as though it had not been done, and לֹא חָשַׁב (2 Sam. xix. 20; cf. حسب, to count, to reckon, οὐ λογίζεσθαι, Rom. iv. 6–9), as a not imputing; the δικαιοσύνη χωρὶς ἔργων is here plainly expressed. The justified one is called נְשׂוּי־פֶּשַׁע, as one exonerated from transgression, *prævaricatione levatus* (Ges., § 135, 1); נְשׂוּי, instead of נְשָׂא, Isa. xxxiii. 24, is meant to accord with כְּסוּי (part. to כָּסָה, just as בָּרוּךְ is part. to בָּרַךְ; *vid.* on Isa. xxii. 13), and the conjecture, נָשׁוּי, according to which reading Sexta (in Field) translates οὗ ἐπελήσθη ἡ ἁμαρτία, is not required. A man, whose sin is covered, is one, over whose sins the covering of expiation lies in God's holy sight (כְּפֻּר, root כף, to cover, cognate to غفر, خفر, خمر, غمر). The third designation is an attributive clause: "to whom Jahve does not reckon his misdeeds," inasmuch as He rather looks upon them as discharged or settled. But only he in whose spirit[1] there is no רְמִיָּה, deceit, which denies and conceals, extenuates and excuses this or that favourite sin, is such a justified one. Any such sin wilfully retained is a secret curse, hindering justification.

Vers. 3–5. For, as the poet has learned from his own experience, whoever does not pour out his whole corruption in confession before God, only tortures himself, till he unburdens himself of his secret curse. Since *v.* 3 cannot of itself be regarded as the reason for the proposition laid down, כִּי means either "because, quod" (*e.g.* Prov. xxii. 22) or "when, quum" (Jud. xvi. 16, Hos. xi. 1). The שְׁאָגָה was the outburst of the tortures which an accusing conscience caused him. The more he strove against confessing, the louder did his conscience speak, and seeing it was not in his power to silence this inner voice, in which God's wrath found ex-

[1] Jerome, *ep. ad Sun. et Fret.*, 19, remarks against the LXX., or rather against Symmachus (ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ), that the original text has BRUCHO not BAFFIO (בפיו).

pression, he cried all the day, viz. for help, but because it was with a yet unbroken heart, he got no answer. He cried all the day, for God's punishing right hand (xxxviii. 3, xxxix. 11) lay heavy on him night and day, the sense of the divine anger gave him no rest (cf. Job xxxiii. 14 *ff.*). A fire burned within him, which threatened to consume him utterly. The word used is בְּחָרְבֹנַי (not כְּחַרְבֹנִי),[1] inasmuch as he directly calls the anxieties which pierce him through and through, and scorch him up, droughts of summer. The בְּ is that of the condition in which the change, *i.e.* the decay (Job xx. 14) took place; for *mutare in aliquid* is expressed by לְ הָפַךְ. In לְשַׁדִּי the ל (which Saadia and others mistook) is part of the root; לֹשׁ (from לָשַׁד, لسد, to suck, to drink up) is inflected like גֹּמֶל, and such like, and means *succus*. In the summer heat of anxiety, his moisture underwent a change: it consumed away and dried up. The music here swells, and helps to portray this anguish of an awakened conscience, while the heart is yet unbroken. But in spite of this διάψαλμα, the historical circumstances are still so powerfully felt, that אוֹדִיעֲךָ obtains the force of an historical *impf.* (cf. xxx. 9, xcv. 10): "my sin I made known, and mine iniquity I did not hide" (כָּסָה, as Prov. xxviii. 13, Job xxxi. 33); I formed the resolution: "I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord (הוֹדָה = הִתְוַדָּה, Neh. i. 6, ix. 2, elsewhere with the accus.; *vid.* Prov. *ut supra*)—then Thou forgavest . . ." Hupf. would place אמרתי before חטאתי אודיעך, whereby כסיתי and אודיעך would become *futures*, but ועוני לא כסיתי sounds like the assertion of a fact, not of an intention, and ואתה נשׂאת is a natural continuation of the immediately preceding אמרתי. Instead of נִתְּשָׂא, ואתה נשׂאת is used designedly. With his confession of sin, made *fide supplice*, there came to him at once absolution: then Thou forgavest the

[1] It may certainly be a question, whether in passages such as this one, and also, *e.g.* xxxvii. 20, cii. 4, Jer. xxxiv. 5, ב is not a corruption of כ, just as whether in *e.g.* x. 4, the כ is not a corruption of ב.

guilt (עָוֹן, the misdeed as a fact, and also the result of the fact, *i.e.* guilt contracted, and penance, or punishment; cf. Lam. iv. 6, Zech. xiv. 19) of my sin. "*Vox nondum est in ore*," says Augustine, "*et vulnus sanatur in corde.*" סלה is here the opposite of the previous one. There it is a shrill wail over the sinner torturing himself for no good, here a clear note of joy over the blessed experience of him who pours out his heart to God—a musical Yea and Amen to the great truth of justifying grace.

Vers. 6, 7. For this grace, provided for every sinner, who confesses with penitence, let each חסיד then, who desires חסד, turn to Jahve in prayer לְעֵת מְצֹא, at the time (xxi. 10; 1 Chron. xii. 22; cf. בְּעֵת, Isa. xlix. 8) when He and His grace are to be found (cf. Deut. iv. 29 with Jer. xxix. 13, Isa. lv. 6, בְּהִמָּצְאוֹ). This hortatory wish is followed by an assuring promise. Although, like אַף, אַךְ, גַּם, כֵּן, רַק also, even when belonging to a part of the sentence following further on, is, *per hypallagen*, placed at its very beginning, and made to refer to the whole sentence (as Prov. xiii. 10: with pride there is only contention), we are prevented from connecting it with אֵלָיו here for this reason, that לִשְׁטֹף מַיִם רַבִּים is virtually a *protasis: quum inundant aquæ magnæ* (ל of time), which cuts רַק off from אֵלָיו. The restrictive signification, here, as often (Deut. iv. 6, Jud. xiv. 16, 1 Kings xxi. 25, cf. Ps. xci. 8), has passed over into an affirmative: *certo quum*, etc. Flooding is an exemplative description of the divine judgment (cf. Nah. i. 8), 6 *b c* is a short expression for the promise unfolded in Ps. xci. In *v.* 7 David confirms it from his own experience. The similarity of sound in מִצַּר תִּצְּרֵנִי (Thou wilt preserve me, so that צַר, *angustum* = *angustiæ*, cxix. 143, may not touch me), is not unintentional, and תצרני is followed by רני, just as in xxix. 9 after בהיכל we have כלו. There is no valid reason, with Houbigant and others, to set aside רָנֵי as a repetition of the half of תצרני. The *inf.* רֹן (Job xxxviii. 7) may be inflected as a substantive with as good reason as רֹב, *pl.* רִבֵּי,

חֹק, *pl.* חֻקִּי; and פֶּלֶט, likewise treated as a substantive (as in lvi. 8; cf. נֶפֶשׁ, Dan. xii. 7), is as unobjectionable a genitive as דעת in אִישׁ דֵּעָה.[1] Jahve surrounds him with songs of deliverance, so that they encompass him on all sides, and an occasion to rejoice meets him wheresoever he turns himself. The music here for the third time becomes *forte*, and that too, in order to give expression to the highest feeling of delight.

Vers. 8–10. It is not Jahve who here replies to the words hitherto addressed to Him. In that case the person addressed must have been the poet himself; but he has already won the knowledge here treated of. It is he himself who now assumes the tone of a teacher (cf. xxxiv. 12). What David promises in li. 15, he here puts into practice: he instructs sinners in the way of salvation. There is no need with Olsh. and Dyserinck to read אִיעֶצְךָ instead of אִיעֲצָה; the suff. of אַשְׂכִּילְךָ and אוֹרְךָ (instead of אוֹרֶךָּ) is available for this third verb, to which שָׂם עָלֶיךָ עֵינִי = עָלֶיךָ עֵינִי (fixing the eye upon thee, *i.e.* taking care of thee with sympathising love; Jer. xl. 4, cf. Zech. iii. 9) stands in the relation of a subordinate relative clause. That עליך is not to be connected with איעצה, is evident from this, that יעץ על is the expression commonly used to indicate a resolution hostile to any one, *e.g.* Isa. vii. 5. The LXX. translates *ἐπιστηριῶ ἐπὶ σὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου*, and therefore takes יָעַץ in the sense of *ἐπιστηρίζων* (cog. עצה, *στηρίζειν*, Prov. xvi. 30, LXX.) as governing עיני, but without any support from the *usus loquendi*. The address passes over in *v.* 9 into the plural, but without any change in the object, and the expression becomes harsh, in conformity with the perverted nature it describes. The meaning as a whole is clear: an obedience not constrained, but voluntary, is becoming in man, in con-

[1] It is the same word as the Babylonian-Assyrian *balâṭu*, life, literally *vita superstes* (cf. Gen. xlv. 7); *Inf. Pi. bulluṭu*, to preserve life, to save life.

tradistinction to the irrational animal, which has to be led by a bridle drawn through its mouth. The asyndeton: like a horse, a mule (פֶּרֶד, so named as swift of foot, *vid.* Fried. Delitzsch's *Prolegomena*, p. 94 *f.*), has nothing remarkable about it (cf. xxxv. 14, Isa. xxxviii. 14). The meaning too of בֶּלֶם is not doubtful; cf. *Chullin*, 89 *a*: "The world continues only through the merit of those who bridle themselves (מי שׁבולם עצמו) at the time of conflict." But it is not clear what עֶדְיִי signifies. We might take it in its ordinary signification, ornament: "with bit and bridle, its ornament" (as *e.g.* Jefeth), and we might find the unintelligent servility of the beast indicated in this, that its ornament should be at the same time the means to keep it in check, unless perhaps עֶדְיִי is equivalent to harness. The LXX. is different: *in camo et freno*, as the Vulgate renders it, *maxillas eorum constringe qui non approximant ad te*. Whether עדיו means harness or (read עַדָּיו[1]) cheeks, in any case לְבַלּוֹם is to be taken according to Ges., § 132, note 1, Driver, § 204; for if we connect "harness for constraint" (Baur), then the governing clause for "with bit and bridle" is wanting, since בַּל קָרֹב אֵלֶיךָ does not suit for that purpose. Therefore, since linguistic proof is wanting for עֶדְיִי, cheek: with bit and bridle, their harness, are they to be tamed, *domandi sunt* (Riehm). If we go on translating: lest they come too nigh to thee, namely to hurt thee (Targ., Syr., Raschi, and others), that gives no point of comparison corresponding to the context of this Psalm. It is therefore better to translate: otherwise there is no coming near to thee to be thought of. This interpretation takes the emphasis on the בל into account, and

[1] Ewald and Hitzig (on Ezek. xvi. 7) compare the Arab. خَدّ (*plur.* خُدُود), but this, connected with גָּדוּד, furrow, signifies properly the furrow on the countenance, *i.e.* the deepened parts running from the inner corners of the eyes downwards to both sides of the nose, then also by synecdoche, the cheek generally.

assumes that, according to a usage of the language not otherwise to be proved, one might say, *e.g.* בַּל לְכָתִי שָׁמָּה, I will never go hither. In Prov. xxiii. 17 also בַּל involves the verb, to be. So here: by no means a coming near to thee, *i.e.* if thou dost not bridle them, there is no drawing near to thee. The words are not addressed to God, but to man, who has to tame the animal by stern means of constraint, and only thus can constrain it to his service. In the antitype it is the sinner, who will not come to God, though He only is his help, and who, as David has experienced, must first endure inward misery, before he comes to his right mind. This agonising life of a guilty conscience, which the godless man leads, is put in *v.* 10 in contrast with the grace, which surrounds on all sides those who trust in God. רַבִּים stands first as an attributive, just as the Arab. *keṯîrûn* does sometimes; in such a case the Arabic grammarians regard the second word as in apposition (*bejân*), *vid.* on lxxxix. 51. The concluding sentence may be translated: grace compasses him about, but the *Po.* and *v.* 7 favour the rendering: with grace does He compass him about.

Ver. 11. Now that the doctrinal teaching of the Psalm has been thus unfolded in three unequal strophes, there follows a yet shorter conclusion, corresponding to the short introduction. This conclusion calls upon those spoken of in the opening verses as blessed, to shout for joy. The intensive הָרְנִינוּ is excellently translated by Aq. by αἰνοποιήσατε.

PSALM XXXIII.

PRAISE OF THE RULER OF THE WORLD AS THE PROTECTOR OF HIS PEOPLE.

1 Exult, ye righteous, in Jahve;
To the upright praise is seemly.
2 Praise Jahve with the cithern,
With a ten-stringed nabla play unto Him.

3 Sing unto Him a new song;
Play merrily with glad sound.

4 For upright is the word of Jahve,
And all His doing is in faithfulness.
5 He loveth righteousness and justice;
The earth is full of Jahve's grace.

6 By Jahve's word were the heavens made,
And by the breath of His mouth all their host.
7 He gathereth, as a heap, the waters of the sea,
He layeth up in storehouses the depths.

8 Let all the earth fear before Jahve,
Before Him let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe.
9 For He spake, and it was done;
He commanded, and it stood fast.

10 Jahve hath brought to nought the counsel of the heathen,
He hath frustrated the thoughts of the nations.
11 The counsel of Jahve standeth for ever,
The thoughts of His heart to all generations.

12 Blessed is the nation which hath Jahve for its God,
The people whom He chooseth for His inheritance.
13 From heaven doth Jahve look down;
He seeth all the children of men.

14 From the place of His habitation He looketh
On the inhabitants of the earth,
15 He who formeth all their hearts together,
Who giveth heed to all their works.

16 A king doth not conquer by great force;
A hero is not delivered by great strength.
17 A horse is a vain thing for victory,
And its great strength helpeth not to escape.

18 Behold, Jahve hath His eye upon them that fear Him,
Upon them that hope in His grace;
19 To deliver their soul from death,
And to keep them alive in famine.

20 Our soul waiteth for Jahve,
Our help and our shield is He.
21 For in Him shall our heart rejoice,
Because we trust in His holy name.
22 Let then Thy grace, Jahve, be upon us,
According as we hope in Thee!

An anonymous congregational song of a hymnic character follows David's *Maskil* (Ps. xxxii.); it begins as the latter ends; and according to Origen and Eusebius, it is anonymous (*ἀνεπίγραφος*) in the original text of the LXX. It seems to owe its origin to some national deliverance from heathen oppression, which was brought about, without war, by God's interposition. Moreover, it shows no such trace of dependence on earlier models as might lead us to bring it down late, say to the time of Jeremiah (Hitz.), or, with the later titles in the LXX. and the Peschito, to the times of Haggai and Zechariah. Its structure is symmetrical. Between two hexastichs (*vv.* 1–3, 20–22) the *materia laudis* is set forth in eight tetrastichs.

Ver. 1–3. The call contained in this hexastich is addressed to the righteous and upright, whose earnest desire is to order their lives in a godly and God-pleasing way, and whose conduct has only one aim, which is directed according to God's will and good pleasure. Those only know God, within whom His true nature has a clear mirror; and so they ought with gladness to acknowledge what they have in Him. For it is their duty and at the same time their honour to glorify Him, to make their boast in Him; נָאוָה, fem. of the adj. נָאוֶה (from נאה), as cxlvii. 1; cf. Prov. xix. 10. As to בְּנֵבֶל (LXX. generally *κιθάρα* or *κινύρα*) and נֵבֶל (LXX. generally *νάβλα* or *ψαλτήριον*, twice *ὄργανον*), *vid.* Introduction, § 2; the harp is called נֵבֶל, perhaps from נבל, *jaculari* (*sagittas*), because of its original bow-shape, and נֵבֶל עָשׂוֹר, the harp of the decade (Aq. *ἐν νάβλᾳ δεκάδος*), is the ten-stringed harp (LXX. *ἐν ψαλτηρίῳ δεκαχόρδῳ*), also simply called עָשׂוֹר, and different from the usual נֵבֶל (xcii. 4). Contrary to the tenor of the words, Aben Ezra, by a comparison of the asyndeta in xxxv. 14, Jer. xi. 19, understands by נבל עשור two instruments. Gecatilia, whom he controverts, errs only in this, that he understands the ten to refer to holes (נקבים) instead of to strings. The בְּ is the *Beth instr.*, like *κιθαρίζειν ἐν*

κιθάραις (Rev. xiv. 2). A "new song" is one which, in consequence of new great deeds by God, comes from a fresh impulse of gratitude in the heart (xl. 4 and frequently, Isa. xlii. 10, Judith vi. 13, Rev. v. 9). In הֵיטִיבוּ the ideas of *scite* and *strenue*, *suaviter* and *naviter*, are blended. By בְּתְרוּעָה, referring back to רַנְּנוּ, the call closes as in a circle.

Vers. 4, 5. Now begins the body of the song. The call to praise God is based (1) on a representation of His praiseworthiness (*a*) as the God of revelation in the kingdom of grace. His word is יָשָׁר, uprightly meant, and, without becoming untrue to itself in any respect, straightway fulfilling itself; His every act is an act which fulfils itself in אֱמוּנָה, faithfulness, which proves the truth of His word and the kindness of His will. As to אֹהֵב הוּא = אֹהֵב, *vid.* vii. 10, xxii. 29. צְדָקָה is righteousness regarded as conduct; מִשְׁפָּט is right as a rule of judgment and a condition. חֶסֶד is accusative (as cxix. 64): *misericordiâ Dei plena est terra* (Introit for *Misericordias* Sunday).

Vers. 6–9. God's praiseworthiness (*b*) as the Creator of the world in the kingdom of nature. Jahve's דְּבַר is His almighty "Let there be," and רוּחַ פִּיו (inasmuch as the breath is here regarded as the material of which the word is formed and its bearer) the command, or generally the working of His commanding omnipotence (Job xv. 30, cf. iv. 9; Isa. xxxiv. 16, cf. ix. 4). The heavens above and the sea beneath are placed alongside each other as miracles of creation. The evidence of His power in the waters beneath consists in this, that He has set for them fixed boundaries, and keeps them within these. The article in כַּנֵּד is the generic article (*vid.* Riehm on xvii. 12). נֵד (Aq. χύμα, Quinta, σωρόν) is a heap, *i.e.* a piled up heap (Arab. *nadd*), and in particular a harvest heap: like such a heap do the convex waters of the sea, being kept firmly together, rise above the lower *terra firma*. The expression is like that in Josh. iii. 13, 16 (cf. Ex. xv. 8), although there what is spoken of is a miracle in

history, here a miracle in creation. כַּנֵּם refers to the heap itself, not to the encompassing walls of the storehouse. The latter image appears first in *v.* 7 *b*; the bed of the sea and of the streams are like אוֹצָרוֹת, granaries, or storehouses, in which God has deposited the foaming deep water billows (תְּהוֹמוֹת, from הוּם, or perhaps more correctly after the Assyrian from תָּהַם, to foam).[1] The inhabitants (יֹשְׁבֵי) of the earth have cause to fear God (יָגוֹר in the sense of shrinking back from in fear), who is thus almighty, for, as the six days' work of creation shows, and as human history also verifies (Lam. iii. 37), He needs but to speak a word, and what He wills comes into being out of nothing; He needs but to command, and it stands forth like an obedient servant, who hastens to appear at the call of his lord (cxix. 91).

Vers. 10, 11. His praiseworthiness (*c*) as the irresistible Ruler in history. Since הֵפֵר עֵצָה (2 Sam. xv. 34, xvii. 14, and often) is a common phrase, הֵפִיר, as in lxxxix. 34, Ezek. xvii. 19, from פּוּר (whence פּוּרָה, a wine press), is equivalent to הֵפֵר, from פָּרַר. Since the new song presupposes new material, the perfects are not used abstractly, but of what has been recently experienced. With *v.* 11 cf. Prov. xix. 21. The עֵצַת of God is the unity of the "thoughts of His heart," *i.e.* of the ideas which form the innermost side, the final motives of all that happens: the whole history of the world is the uninterrupted carrying through of a divine plan of salvation, the primary object of which is His people, in and with them, however, also the whole of humanity.

Vers. 12–19. Accordingly the summons to praise God is justified (2) by a statement of that which His people possesses in Him. This portion of the hymn is like a paraphrase of the אַשְׁרֵי of Deut. xxxiii. 29. In *vv.* 13–15 the thesis of *v.* 12 is proved by the fact, that, being the Creator of men, Jahve is the omniscient Ruler, without whose knowledge nothing is undertaken either secretly or openly, and

[1] In Assyr. the sea is called *ti' âmtu* or *tâmtu*, plur. *tâmâte*.

more especially if against His people; and then in 16–19, by the fact that in Jahve they have a stronger defence than the greatest worldly power would be. As in Zech. xii. 1 (cf. Prov. xxiv. 12), Jahve is called the fashioner of the hearts of all men, as being their Creator; He is called so, however, not abstractly as being the one to whom the commencement of their existence may be traced back, but as the one to whom they owe their individual character or quality. As the author not only of the existence, but of the so and so conditioned existence, the so and so constituted inner nature, of men, He is also the observer of all their doings; for He knows even of their origin in the laboratory of the heart, which was formed by Him as Creator. Hupfeld takes יַחַד as an equalization (*pariter ac*) of the two attributive statements; but in that case it must have been וּמֵבִין (cf. xlix. 3, 11); the LXX. and Symm. translate it correctly: *καταμόνας*, *singillatim*. It is not necessary to resolve the participle so as to give it the signification of a perfect: "He who hath formed" (Riehm); the hearts of men were not all formed at once in the very beginning; but the primordial method of communicating spirit is continued in some mysteriously effected manner on each occasion that a human being is begotten. God is the Father of spirits (Heb. xii. 9). For this very reason everything that exists is encompassed, and that too even to its innermost part, by His omniscience and omnipotence: He exercises an omniscient control over everything, and makes everything subservient to the ends embraced within His world-plan, which is for His people a plan of salvation. Without Him there takes place nothing; through Him, everything. The victory gained by the king, the rescue effected by the hero, are not the work of their own hands. Their great military power and bodily strength accomplish nothing without God, who can be mighty even in the weak. Even the war-horse is for the purpose of victory (תְּשׁוּעָה; cf. יְשׁוּעָה, xxi. 2) שֶׁקֶר, *i.e.*

a thing that promises much but in reality accomplishes nothing; it is not his great strength, by means of which he causes his rider to escape (יְמַלֵּט); "the horse," says Solomon (Prov. xxi. 31), "is equipped for the day of battle, but לה׳ הַתְּשׁוּעָה, the victory belongs to Jahve," He grants it to whomsoever He will. The final issues of all that happens lie in His hand and, as *v.* 18*f.*, pointing with הִנֵּה to the great truth, say, the eye of this God, *i.e.* the final end of His government of the world, has in view them that fear Him, is concerned with them that wait upon His grace (לַמְיַחֲלִים). The object, לְחַסְדּוֹ, is expanded by way of illustration in *v.* 19. In the consciousness of their conditionality and helplessness, it is from His grace, not from their own works, that they look for protection in extreme peril and for prolongation of their life in time of famine. Ps. xx. 8 is similar; but the one passage sounds as independent as the other.

Vers. 20–22. Accordingly, in this concluding hexastich, the Church acknowledges Him as its help, its shield, its fountain of joy. חִכָּה, which belongs to the group of words expressive of hoping and waiting, occurs in only one other place in the Psalter (viz. in cvi. 13); the root-idea, to make fast or firm, passes over into that of directing steadily, expecting eagerly, just as קִוָּה also goes back upon קָוָה, Arabic *kawija* = to be strained or stretched, firm, strong (*vid.* on Isa. viii. 17). In 20*b* also, the primary passage (Deut. xxxiii. 29; cf. *v.* 26) is still resounding. As in cxv. 9–11, the principal stress lies upon הוּא, with which בּוֹ connects *v.* 21: He is the unlimited sphere, the inexhaustible material, the perennial source of our joy. The second כִּי substantiates this from the subjective side. His holy name is the ground of His Church's faith, love, and hope; for from thence cometh its salvation. It can confidently pray that the grace of the Lord may be bestowed upon it, for it waits upon Him; and human waiting and divine granting mutually condition

one another. This is the meaning of the בְּאֹשֶׁר. It holds God to His word. The *Te Deum laudamus* of Ambrose closes in the same manner: "Show us Thy mercy, as we hope in Thee."

PSALM XXXIV.

THANKSGIVING AND TEACHING OF ONE WHO HAS BEEN DELIVERED.

2 א I will bless Jahve at all times,
Let His praise be continually in my mouth.
3 ב My soul shall make her boast in Jahve,
The meek shall hear thereof and rejoice.
4 ג Magnify Jahve with me,
And let us exalt His name together.
5 ד I sought Jahve and He answered me,
And out of all my terrors did He deliver me.
6 ה They look unto Him and are lightened,
And the face of such doth not hide itself in shame.
7 ז This afflicted one cried, and Jahve heard,
And saved him out of all his troubles.
8 ח The angel of Jahve encampeth round about them that fear Him
And setteth them free.
9 ט Taste and see that Jahve is good!
Happy the man that hideth himself in Him.
10 י Fear Jahve, ye His holy ones!
For they that fear Him have no want.
11 כ Young lions do lack and suffer hunger,
But they that endeavour after Jahve want no good thing.
12 ל Come, ye children, hearken unto me;
I will teach you the fear of Jahve.
13 מ Whosoever thou art, wouldst thou live long,
Lovest thou days in order to see good—
14 נ Guard thy tongue from evil
And thy lips from deceitful speaking.
15 ס Depart from evil and do good,
Seek peace and pursue it.
16 ע The eyes of Jahve attend to the righteous
And His ears to their loud cry.
17 פ Jahve's face is against them that do evil,
To cut off the remembrance of them from the earth.

18 צ Those cry unto Jahve and He heareth,
And He delivereth them out of all their troubles.
19 ק Jahve is nigh unto the broken in heart,
And saveth them that are crushed in spirit.
20 ר Many are the afflictions of the righteous,
But Jahve delivereth him out of them all.
21 שׁ He keepeth all his bones,
Not one of them is broken.
22 ת Evil shall slay the wicked,
And they that hate the righteous are held guilty.
23 פ Jahve setteth free the souls of His servants,
And all they that take refuge in Him shall be held guiltless.

In xxxiii. 18 we heard the words: "behold the eye of Jahve is upon them that fear Him," and in xxxiv. 16 we hear this same great thought: "the eyes of Jahve are upon the righteous." Ps. xxxiv. is one of the eight Psalms, which are assigned by their titles to the time when David was persecuted by Saul, and have originated upon the long way of suffering from Gibea of Saul to Ziklag (in some such chronological order as this: vii., lix., lvi., xxxiv., lii., lvii., cxlii., liv.). The title runs: "of David, when he feigned madness (טַעְמוֹ with orthophonic Daghesh, in order that it might not be pronounced טָעֲמוֹ) before Abimelech, and he drove him away (וַיְגָרְשֵׁהוּ, with *Chatef Pathach*, as is always the case with verbal stems having ר as the second radical, if the accent is on the third) and he departed." Being hard pressed by Saul, David fled for safety to the country of the Philistines; here they recognized in him the man who had been such a dangerous foe for several years, and arraigned him before King Achish. Ps. lvi. (related to Ps. xxxiv. in the same way as li. to xxxii.) is a prayer for help at that same time of trouble. David's life would have been lost, if his desperate attempt to escape by playing the *rôle* of a madman (Syr. ܡܕܡܢ) had not succeeded. The king commanded him to depart, and David betook himself once more to a place of concealment in his native country, to the cave

of Adullam in the wilderness of Judah. The correctness of the title has been disputed. Hupfeld maintains that the writer has blindly taken it from 1 Sam. xxi. 14. According to Redslob, Hitzig, Olshausen and Stähelin, he had reasons for doing so, although they were of no weight. The טַעְמוֹ of the Psalm (*v.* 9) harmonised in his opinion with the טַעְמוֹ of 1 Sam. xxi. 14, and he further combined the תִּתְהַלֵּל, *gloriaris*, of the Psalm (*v.* 3) with the וַיִּתְהוֹלֵל, *insanivit*, of 1 Sam. xxi. 14. We judge otherwise. The Psalm contains no express reference to that occurrence among the Philistines; and from this we infer that the writer of the title knew of this reference from tradition. His source is not the Books of Samuel; for there the king is called אָכִישׁ, he, however, calls him אֲבִימֶלֶךְ, and, as Basil has already recognized (*vid.* Euthymius Zigabenus' introduction to this Psalm), this is the official title of the Philistine kings, just as Pharaoh is that of the Egyptian, Agag that of the Amalekite, and Lucumo that of the Etruscan kings. As a comparison of 2 Sam. xxii. 1 with Ps. xviii. 1 shows, his source is a different work, viz. the annals of David, in which he found this and other Psalms in the historical connection which he indicates in the title with words taken from his source. The fact that the Psalm is alphabetical does not militate against its Davidic authorship (*vid.* on Pss. ix., x,). It is not arranged for music; for although it begins after the manner of a hymn of praise, it soon passes over into a didactic tone. It consists of two-lined strophes, which are strung on to one another according to the order of the letters of the alphabet. The letter ו is wanting, like נ in Ps. cxlv.; and, as in Ps. xxv., the counterpart of xxxiv., ת is followed by a second supernumerary פ. Out of xxv. 22 Lagarde reads the name פְּדָהְאֵל and out of xxxiv. 23 the name פְּדָיָה—these were the names, as he thinks, of the couple of poets, to whom we owe these two Psalms.[1]

[1] Acrostics on authors' names or mottoes indicative of the purport of a

Vers. 2–4. The poet begins with praise of Jahve and with a summoning of all the godly to praise Him along with him. The noun-clause, 2 *b*, is meant cohortatively in exactly the same way as the verbal clause, 2 *a*. As distinguished from עֲנִיִּים, *afflicti*, עֲנָוִים, from עָנָה (an active formation like רָחָב), are such as have learned patience in the school of affliction. The praise of the psalmist will conduce to the strengthening of these; for it applies to the deliverer of the oppressed. In order, however, that this strain of praise may sound forth from as many voices as possible, he courts associates (*v.* 4). To acknowledge the divine goodness in strains of praise is called גָּדַל, in lxix. 31 with an accusative, here with לְ: to offer Him גְּדֻלָּה (cf. xxix. 2). רוֹמֵם also is meant in the sense of avowing and confessing: to place God's exalted name as high in one's heart, in word, and in deed, as it is in itself.

Vers. 5–7. The poet now justifies his praise of Jahve by setting forth the deliverance he has experienced. He longed for God and sought anxiously after Him (the meaning of דָּרַשׁ as distinguished from בִּקֵּשׁ), and this striving, manifesting itself in prayer, did not remain without an actual answer (עָנָה said of hearing and fulfilling as a response or answer to the petition of the suppliant): the perfects, as also in *vv.* 6 and 7, describe facts, neither of which was without the other, whereas וַיַּעֲנֵנִי would represent them as standing in the relation of cause and effect. In *v.* 6, the personal experience of the psalmist is generalised into a truth of experience expressed in a historical form: they look unto Him and brighten up, *i.e.* whoever looks unto Him (הִבִּיט אֶל, said of a look of earnest longing for salvation, as in Num. xxi. 9, Zech. xii. 10) brightens up. To make the עֲנָוִים of *v.* 3 the subject here is impracticable; an act and an experience that is straightway to be associated with it is expressed in gnomic

poem are nowhere to be found in Old Testament poetry; those which G. Bickell (*D. M. Z.*, xxvi. 811) thinks he has found are witticisms of the discoverer.

perfects and with a most general subject. The verb נָהַר does not here signify to stream, pour in (Jer.: *confluite*, like the LXX., after the *imperative* reading וְנָהֲרוּ, Luther: to run up to), but, as in Isa. lx. 5, to radiate, glance, shine (Vulg. *illuminamini*), in which signification it is more Aramaic (נְהַר, whence נְהוֹר, light; cf. בָּהַת, to be ashamed, with בּוּשׁ) than Hebrew (poetical נְהָרָה, light). Theodoret: Ὁ μετὰ πίστεως τῷ Θεῷ προσιὼν φωτὸς ἀκτῖνας δέχεται νοεροῦ; upon the faces of such the gracious countenance of God is reflected; the *actus directus* of *fides supplex* is followed by the *actus reflexus* of *fides triumphans*. Nor does it ever come about that their countenances must be covered with shame on account of disappointed hope: it shall not and cannot be, as the subjective negative אַל asserts. In all three dialects חָפַר (חָפֵר), خفر signifies to be ashamed and timid, according to Gesenius and Fürst (√פר) from the root idea, to redden, to blush. It is not, however, a word referring to colour like יֶחֱוָרוּ in Isa. xxix. 22, but is connected, not with حمر, but with خمر (cogn. كفر, כפר, غفر, غمر), with the primary signification, to cover, hide, veil (Arab. *ḫafira*, *taḫaffara*, to be ashamed, said of woman,[1] cogn. *ḫamara*, to be ashamed, to be modest, said of both sexes), so that consequently the shame-covered countenance is contrasted, as that which hides, conceals and veils itself, with that which looks bright, bold and free. In *v.* 7 this general truth is again individualised. In זֶה עָנִי (like זֶה סִינַי, lxviii. 9) David points to himself. From the peril of death to which he was exposed at the Philistine court, and from which God has delivered him, he looks back with praise and thanks upon all the deliverances he has experienced in the past.

Vers. 8–11. Justification of his praise and thanks by an

[1] Cf. حيي, to be ashamed, literally to withdraw within one's self, to draw one's self together, after the manner of the *Mimosa pudica* (*Psychologie*, p. 192).

exposition of the intimate and gracious guardianship under which God's holy ones stand. The מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה is none other than the angel that was the medium of Jahve's gracious intercourse with the patriarchs, and that conducted Israel to Canaan. The name is not collective (Calv., Hupf., Kamphausen, and others), but individual; he, the One, encamps round about, inasmuch as he is the prince of the host of Jahve (Josh. v. 14), and is therefore accompanied by hosts of inferior ministering angels, or inasmuch as, being a spirit transcending space, he can afford protection that covers them on every side. חֹנֶה (cf. Zech. ix. 9) perhaps alludes to מַחֲנַיִם in Gen. xxxii. 2*f.*, that camp of angels which joined Jacob's and surrounded it like a barricade. On the *impf. consec.* וַיְחַלְּצֵם *et expedit eos* as a pure expression of sequence, or even only of close inner connection, *vid.* Ew., § 343 *a*.[1] On the ground of this protection by means of the angel of God men are summoned in *v.* 9 to experience the friendliness of God for themselves. That God is טוֹב, appears here as something to be tasted, just as in Arabic طَيِّب means something that has an agreeable taste or smell.[2] Ps. xxii. 27 may be compared with this invitation. Tasting (γεύσασθαι, Heb. vi. 4*f.*, 1 Pet. ii. 3) stands before seeing for spiritual experience leads to spiritual knowledge, and not conversely. *Nisi gustaveris*, says Bernard, *non videbis.* David desires that others also may experience what he has experienced, in order that they may also know what he has known, viz. the goodness of God.[3] Hence, in *v.* 10, the call to the saints to fear Jahve (יִרְאוּ, with quiescent א, instead of יִרְאוּ, in order to distinguish

[1] On the accentuation of *v.* 8 (where *Rebia mugrasch* is a transformation of *Athnach*, preceded by conjunctive *Schalscheleth*) *vid.* Wickes, *Accentuation*, pp. 77 and 95.

[2] Cf. Assyr. *bašâmu*, to have an agreeable smell, then to be good in general.

[3] On account of this *v.* 9, Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε κ.τ.λ., Ps. xxxiii. was the communion Psalm of the early Church; *Constit. Apost.* viii. 13; Cyrill., *Catech. Myst.*, v. 17.

between *veremini* and *videbunt*, as in Josh. xxiv. 14, and 1 Sam. xii. 24), for whoever fears Him, has everything in Him. Young full-maned lions (LXX., Vulg., Luther, allegorising: rich men, *divites*) must sooner famish and perish of hunger, because they have no prey, than that he should suffer any want whatsoever, whose earnest endeavour is to have fellowship with God. The verb רוּשׁ (to want, to be poor; in the *impf. Niph.* and *part. Hiph.* it takes the forms of יָרֵשׁ; the root is רשׁ, to make or be loose, limp, if the root-idea is not rather "to long for, desire," a meaning suggested by אֶרֶשֶׁת in xxi. 3),[1] usually said only of men, is transferred here (like בָּקַשׁ מָצָא in civ. 21) to the lions, without כְּפִירִים being meant emblematically (as in xxxv. 17, lvii. 5, xvii. 12) of his powerful foes at the courts of Saul and Achish. The conjecture כֹּפְרִים (deniers, more especially of God, *i.e.* unbelievers) is one that cannot be adopted, for the simple reason that in this sense כֹּפֵר, كافر, is post-biblical. בְּנִים, which does not form an appropriate antithesis to דֹּרְשֵׁי ח׳, is likewise useless.

Vers. 12–15. The first principal division of the Psalm is now ended; the second (in much the same way as in Ps. xxxii.) begins the strain rather of a didactic poem, although even *vv.* 6 and 9–11 are already somewhat in the style of apophthegms. The poet first of all gives instruction as to the way in which the fear of God may be learned. We may compare xxxii. 8, li. 15—how Davidic is the turn which the Psalm takes here! בָּנִים are not children in years or in understanding; but it is a tender form of address of the master who is experienced in God's ways to all and sundry, as in Prov. i. 8 and in many other places. In *v.* 13 he puts a question, which he himself answers in *v.* 14*f.*; this way of enforcing a truth by presenting it as the solution of a question

[1] Just as they say فقير الى (*e.g.* in need of the grace of God), so Karaitic Hebrew has מִתְרוֹשֵׁשׁ אֶל (Gottlober's *Kritische Gesch. der Karäer*, p. 215).

that has been raised, is a habit of David's; cf. xv. 1, xxiv. 8, 10, xxv. 12. In the application made of this passage in 1 Pet. iii. 10–12 (= 13–17 *a* of the Psalm) the interrogative form is obliterated. אֹהֵב יָמִים corresponds to הָפֵץ חַיִּים, having the same complete meaning, so that לִרְאוֹת is consequently an adverbial clause of purpose; יָמִים signifies days in the mass, just as חַיִּים signifies long-enduring life. Why the poet gives special prominence to the avoidance of sins of the tongue, is evident from Jas. iii. 2*ff.*, where even in its form *v.* 13 reminds us of our Psalm. In *v.* 15 peace is specially singled out from among the good; we are not only not to disturb it, but to seek it; yea, we are to pursue it as a hunter pursues the noblest beast of prey. Let us follow, says the Apostle also (Rom. xiv. 19; cf. Heb. xii. 14), after that which makes for peace. שָׁלוֹם is a deportment or behaviour that is well-pleasing to the "God of love and peace" (2 Cor. xiii. 11). The notion of a bond of fellowship is associated with the corresponding εἰρήνη according to its root-idea.

Vers. 16–22. The poet now commends the fear of God, to which he has given a key in a few words, by setting forth its reward in contrast with the punishment of the ungodly. The prepositions אֶל and בְּ alternate of set purpose in 16*a* and 17*b*; the former is said of loving attention and regard (xxxiii. 18, Num. vi. 26), the latter of fixing the eyes upon one in a hostile manner, as in Job vii. 8, Jer. xxi. 10, xliv. 11, after the phrase in Lev. xvii. 10. The evildoers succumb to the power of destruction that proceeds from the face of Jahve, which they have against them, until not the slightest trace is left of their earthly state of existence. The subject of *v.* 18 is not (after the analogy of cvii. 17–19) the עֹשֵׂי רָע (for the trait of penitence that would be indispensable, if that were the case, is wanting), but the צַדִּיקִים. It is probable that the פ-strophe stood originally before the ע-strophe, just as in Lam. ii.–iv., פ precedes ע (Hitz.). In the present sequence of the thoughts *v.* 18 is formed in exactly the

same way as *v.* 6 : *Clamant* (*et Dominus audit*) = *si qui* (*quicunque*) *clamant.* What is meant is a loud crying from out of the depths of a soul despairing of itself. Such a loud crying finds a hearing on the part of God and an answering that verifies itself in the granting of that which was implored. The "broken in heart" are those whose egoistical, *i.e.* self-seeking life, the life that centres round one's own ego, is broken over at the very roots, and the "crushed (דַּכְּאֵי, from דָּכָא, after the form קָטָא, with a reversion of the long *ā* into an original short, according to Stade, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*, § 217 *a*) in spirit" are those whose hard experiences, leading to repentance, have brought down from the false height of their proud self-consciousness and thoroughly humbled. Jahve is nigh unto such; He preserves them from despair; He is ready to raise up in them a new life upon the ruins of the old and to cover their infinite deficiency; He makes them, susceptible and desirous as they are of salvation, partakers of His salvation. It is true, many afflictions befall the righteous (*multa sunt mala justi, i.e. quæ eveniunt justo;* cf. xxxii. 10), but Jahve delivers him מִכֻּלָּן = מִכֻּלָּם (the same carelessness in the use of the genders as in Ruth i. 19, iv. 11). He stands under the most special providence: "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them (*ne unum quidem*) is broken";—a pictorial specialization of the thought that God does not suffer matters to come to extremities with the righteous, that He does not suffer him to be torn from His almighty protecting love, nor to become the plaything of tyrants. Still we cannot but think of the literal fulfilment which these words found in the crucified One; for the Old Testament prophecy, which is quoted in John xix. 33–37, may equally well be traced back to our Psalm as to Ex. xii. 46. Not only the paschal lamb, but to a certain extent even every affliction of the righteous, is a type. In His case human suffering sounds the very lowest depths; all the promises given to the righteous are

also fulfilled in Him, κατ' ἐξοχήν; for He is the righteous One in the most absolute, the Holy One of God in the most unique, sense (Isa. liii. 11, Jer. xxiii. 5, Zech. ix. 9, Acts iii. 14, xxii. 14). The righteous continues to be preserved from coming to extremities; on the other hand evil throttles (מוֹתֵת, stronger than תָּמִית) the ungodly (the same collocation of words as in Job xv. 5): the evil, which he loved and cherished, becomes the hangman's power, to which he falls a prey. The verb אָשַׁם (*vid.* on iv. 11) means both to become or to be guilty and to stand guilty, here, both in *vv.* 22 and 23, to stand as guilty (Jerome, *culpabuntur*), *i.e.* to be held guilty and to pay the penalty. The latter end of both classes will be the antithesis of the judgment and of the prediction pronounced by the world.

Ver. 23. Now that the letters of the alphabet have been gone through, there follows a second פ in precisely the same way as in xxv. 22. Just as the first פ (xxv. 16) is פָּנָה, so here, in *v.* 17, it is פַּגְיָ, and the two supernumerary *Pe's* likewise correspond—there the Elohistic and here the Jehovistic.

PSALM XXXV.

A CALL TO ARMS, ADDRESSED TO GOD, AGAINST UNGRATEFUL PERSECUTORS.

1 Strive, Jahve, with them that strive with me,
Fight against them that fight against me.
2 Take hold of shield and buckler,
And stand up as my help.
3 Draw forth also the spear and stop the way against them that pursue me,
Say unto my soul: I am thy salvation.

4 Let them be shamed and brought to dishonour that seek after my soul,
Turned back be they and covered with shame that devise my hurt.
5 Let them become as chaff before the wind,
The angel of Jahve thrusting them away.

6 Let their way become darkness and slippery places,
The angel of Jahve pursuing them.

7 For without cause have they hid for me their net,
Without cause have they digged a pit for my soul.
8 Let devastation come upon him unawares,
And his net, which he hath hidden, let it catch himself,
With a dull heavy sound let him fall therein.

9 So shall my soul exult in Jahve,
It shall delight itself in His salvation.
10 All my bones shall say: Jahve, who is like unto Thee,
Delivering the afflicted from the stronger than he,
The afflicted and poor from him that spoileth him!

11 Unjust witnesses arise;
They question me of things that I know not.
12 They reward me evil for good,
Bereavement hath come upon my soul.
13 And I—when they lay sick, my clothing was sackcloth,
I mortified my soul with fasting,
And my prayer returned into my bosom.

14 I went about as for my friend, my brother,
As one that mourneth for his mother I crept about in mourning weeds.
15 And now at my fall they are joyous and gather together,
There gather together against me abjects and those whom I do not know,
They rail and cease not.
16 After the manner of common parasites
They gnash upon me with their teeth.

17 O Lord, how long wilt Thou look on?
Fetch back my soul from their destructions,
My only one from lions.
18 I will praise Thee in a great congregation,
Among much people will I sing praise unto Thee.

19 Let not them rejoice over me that are mine enemies for a lie,
They that hate me without cause, let them not wink with the eye.
20 For it is not peaceful words that they utter,
But against the quiet in the land they devise deceitful things.
21 And they open their mouth wide upon me,
They say: Aha, now our eye sees it.

22 Thou seest it, Jahve, therefore keep not silence;
O Lord, remain not far from me.
23 Rouse Thee and awake for my right,
My God and Lord, for my cause.
24 Right me according to Thy righteousness, Jahve my God,
And let them not rejoice over me.

25 Let them not say in their heart: Aha, our desire!
Let them not say: We have swallowed him up.
26 Let them be ashamed and covered with shame together
That rejoice at my misfortune,
Let them be clothed with shame and disgrace
That magnify themselves against me.

27 Let them exult and be glad that rejoice in my sight,
And let them say continually: Jahve be magnified,
Who hath delight in the welfare of His servant.
28 And my tongue shall declare Thy righteousness,
At all times Thy praise.

This Ps. xxxv. forms a couple with Ps. xxxiv.: they are the only Psalms which mention the מלאך ה׳. The Psalms that belong to the time of David's persecution by Saul are especially permeated by such retrospective references to the Thôra. And in fact this whole Psalm is as it were the lyrical amplification of that which David says, when face to face with Saul, in 1 Sam. xxiv. 16. The critical judgment as to the authorship of this Psalm is closely connected with that as to the authorship of Pss. xl. and lxix., to which our Psalm is nearly related (cf. *vv.* 21, 27 with xl. 16*f.*; *v.* 13 with lxix. 11*f.*); whereas the relation of Ps. lxxi. to Ps. xxxv is decidedly secondary. Hitzig guesses at Jeremiah as being the author; but *vv.* 1–3 suit the mouth of a persecuted king, not that, however, of a persecuted prophet; the coincidences of the writings of Jeremiah with our Psalm (Jer. xviii. 19*f.*, xxiii. 12, Lam. ii. 16) may therefore in this case be more certainly regarded as reminiscences than in the case of Ps. lxix. Deep resentment (to which the heavy suffix יְמוֹ– corresponds as in Pss. lix., lvi., xi., xvii., xxii. lxiv.) and intense excitement of feeling prevail throughout the whole

of the Psalm; only in the second portion, where the poet describes the black ingratitude of his enemies, the language becomes calmer and more transparent, and a quieter sadness takes the place of indignation.

Each of the three divisions of the Psalm raises a cry for deliverance, and closes, in the assurance that it will be granted, with a vow of thanksgiving. For this reason these divisions cannot be mistaken: 1–10; 11–18; 19–28. The ratio of the number of the stichoi in the several groups is as follows: 6, 6, 5, 5 | 7, 7, 5 | 6, 6, 6, 5.

Only a few of the Psalms of David belonging to the time of his persecution by Saul keep, like Ps. xxii., within the limits of deep inward sorrow, and almost nowhere is he satisfied with setting forth the accursed fate of his enemies with prophetic certainty as something that he confidently expects (as *e.g.* in vii. 13–17): the objective word announcing their punishment is generally appropriated by his inmost emotions and transformed into the most vehement prayer (as in vii. 7, xvii. 13 and freq.); and this fever-heat of feeling comes out still more harshly, where prayer for the divine punitive judgments passes over into imprecation. In this respect Pss. vii., xxxv., lxix., cix. form a fearful gradation. The old expositors count thirty anathemas in Ps. cix. How are we to account to ourselves for such words in the mouth and heart of the poet? As paroxysms of a desire for vengeance? That even a David was susceptible of such a passion appears from his behaviour towards Nabal; but 1 Sam. xxv. 32*f.* also shows that it required only a gentle stirring of his conscience to dissuade him from it. How much more (like Kurtz, we would leave this to the reader's consideration) will the preponderance of the magnanimity, that was characteristic of him, have asserted itself in the moments of highest religious consecration, in which he composed his Psalms! It is inconceivable that at such moments the unholy fire of personal passion should have mingled with

the holy fire of his love to God. The Psalms are indeed the purest and most faithful mirror of Old Testament piety —the duty of love towards enemies, however, is so far from being foreign to the Old Testament (Ex. xxiii. 4*f.*, Lev. xix. 18, Prov. xx. 22, xxiv. 17, xxv. 21*f.*, Job xxxi. 29*f.*), that when the New Testament is insisting upon it, it makes use of Old Testament expressions. And Ps. vii., in agreement with the history of his behaviour towards Saul, has shown us that David was conscious of having fulfilled this duty. All the imprecations found in those Psalms flow, therefore, from the pure spring of unselfish jealousy for God's honour. That this jealousy appears here as jealousy for his own person, arises from the fact that David stands over against Saul, the king alienated from God, as the divinely anointed heir of the kingdom, and that to his mind the cause of God, the continuance of the Church, and the future of Israel coincide with his own fortunes. The fire of his wrath is kindled at this focus of the view that he takes of himself in connection with the history of redemption. It is therefore holy fire; but, as Jesus Himself asserts in Luke ix. 55, the spirit of the New Testament is in this respect, nevertheless, a relatively different spirit from that of the Old. In those days the divine loving deed of redemption, out of whose open fountain-head there flow forth impulses to a love that embraces and conquers the world, had not yet been performed; and a curtain still hung before eternity, before heaven and hell, so that imprecations like Ps. lxix. 20 were not understood by him that uttered them himself in all their infinite depth. Now that this curtain is rolled up, New Testament faith shrinks back from imprecating a destruction that endures לעולם; and so long as there exists even a shadow of possibility, love seeks to deliver everything that is human from the unconceivable destruction of an unblessed future. Notwithstanding all this, however, there still remains one grave consideration. The curses contained in the Davidic Psalms belonging to the

time of his persecution by Saul are referred to in the New Testament as finding their fulfilment in the enemies of Jesus Christ (Acts i. 20, Rom. xi. 7–10). In John xv. 25 Jesus looks upon one expression in our Psalm (ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν; cf. lxix. 5) as being fulfilled in Himself; it seems therefore as if the whole Psalm must, or at least may, be taken typically as the words of Christ. But nowhere in the Gospels do we read of a curse being pronounced by Jesus upon His own enemies and those of the kingdom of God; David's imprecations are, therefore, not suited to the mouth of the Saviour, and the New Testament citations of them do not stamp them as being His direct words: they see therein words of prophecy in virtue of the Spirit, of whom David was an instrument, and whose work the Scriptures are. And it is only in this sense that the Christian can use them in prayer. For after the example of his Lord, who prayed on the cross: "Father, forgive them," he desires that even the most hostile may not eternally perish, but may rather, even if only in *articulo mortis*, come to repentance. Even the anathemas pronounced by the apostle upon the Judaising false teachers and upon Alexander the coppersmith (Gal. i. 9, v. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 14) refer only to temporal removal and chastisement, not to eternal ruin. They mark the extreme limit, at which, in extraordinary cases, justifiable New Testament zeal comes into contact with that of the Old Testament.

Vers. 1–3. None of the Psalms we have yet considered begins in such a martial and anthropomorphic strain as this one. On the accentuation of רִיבָה upon the last syllable, *vid.* on iii. 8; seeing that there is no occasion for changing the tone, וְקוּמָה retains the accent upon the penult. Both את are signs of the accusative; seeing that God's conquering might is implored, this construction is more natural than to take את as being equivalent to עִם (cf. Isa. xlix. 25 with Isa. xxvii. 8, Job x. 2); and for the same reason also לְחֵם (in the *Kal*, which elsewhere only lends the *part.* לֹחֵם, lvi. 2*f.*, to נלחם) is

used here instead of the reciprocal הִלָּחֵם. It is usually assumed that לָחַם properly means *rorare* (cf. Il. x. 8, πτολέμοιο μέγα στόμα, *fauces belli* in Cicero); but the Arabic لحم suggests a different primary meaning: to press close and compactly (*Niph.* on one another); מִלְחָמָה is therefore a dense crowd, a great tumult and uproar (cf. the Homeric κλόνος and the Old German *Werre* = *Gewirr*, *Handgemenge* (war = confusion, throng, a close fight), whence the French *guerre*); לָחַם as used here may be related as a denominative to מִלְחָמָה in exactly the same way as the German *kriegen* (to wage war, literally to sieze; to have in one's power) is related in the signification *belligerare* to *Krieg* (war). The summons to Jahve, to provide Himself with defensive armour, and, that too, in a twofold manner: with the מָגֵן, which wards off the enemy's blows, and the צִנָּה (*vid.* v. 13) which covers the body like a *testudo* (and seeing it is impossible to make use of both shields at the same time, the figure is idealised), implies that in every way He is to make Himself felt by His enemies, and to their confusion, as the unapproachable One. The ב of בְּעֶזְרָתִי (in the quality of help turned towards me) is, as in Ex. xviii. 4, Prov. iii. 26, Isa. xlviii. 10 (*tanquam argentum*) and in many other passages, the so-called *Beth essentiæ*.[1] הָרִיק is meant in the same sense as in Ex. xv. 9,

[1] The Hebrew *Beth essentiæ* as an expression of the being of one thing in another, of the essential or characteristic quality, is used in a much freer and more comprehensive manner than the Arabic, which is joined only with the predicate of a simple clause, where in our languages the verb is "to be," and, with few exceptions (de Sacy, ii. p. 471, § 1036), only with the predicate of negative clauses: *laisa bi-ḥakimin*, he is not wise, or *laisa bi-l-ḥakimi*, he is not the wise one. The predicate, accordingly, may be indeterminate or determinate. In Hebrew also, where this ב appears along with the predicate, the complement of the subject, or even, although only as a solecism (*vid.* Ges., *Thes.*, p. 175), with the subject, the word that has it may be determinate, whether as being a proper name it was determined by itself (Ex. vi. 3: בְּאֵל שַׁדָּי), or by a suffix (as above xxxv. 2; cf. cxlvi. 5, Ex. xviii. 4, Prov. iii. 26),

Lev. xxvi. 33: to take out, draw forth, draw; for just as a sword when not in use is in its sheath, so a spear is in the δουροδόκη (Od., i. 128). By סְגֹר Parchon already understands a weapon, and some have compared σάγαρις, a name given in Herod., Xen. and Strabo to the Upper Asiatic and more especially Scythian battle-axe;[1] but סָגֹר, thus defectively written, has the look of an imperative, is taken by all the old versions as an imperative, and as such gives a satisfactory meaning: close, *i.e.* cut off, *interclude* scil. *viam*. The word has *Dechî*, because לִקְרַאת רֹדְפָי, "casting thyself upon my pursuers," belongs to both imperatives; Dachselt refers to the same sequence of the accents in lv. 19, lxvi. 15. The Mosaic figure of Jahve the אישׁ מלחמה (Ex. xv. 3, Deut. xxxii. 41 *f.*) is worked out here in bright colours under the influence of a spirit that is full of wrath. But how spiritually everything is nevertheless meant, is evident from *v.* 3. In God's interposition in his behalf by means of His wondrous deeds, David would fain hear His consolatory address to himself. That God's love would break through the appearance of wrath it has at present assumed, and make itself felt by him—that is what he longs for in his supplication.

Vers. 4–8. Now follow fearful imprecations, extending through two strophes. According to its radical notion the verb בּוֹשׁ means *disturbari* (*vid.* vi. 11) and חָפַר, *obtegere*, *abscondere* (*vid.* xxxiv. 6); נִכְלַם, however, going back upon the primary signification, to hit, *ferire*, *icere* (כלם), properly means, to be struck (with disgrace) and confounded (with

or even by the article; at least, so far as the syntax is concerned, no objection can be taken to the interpretation of בָּעָשָׁן (xxxvii. 20): in the manner (quality) of smoke" (cf. בַּהֶבֶל, lxxviii. 33), and of בַּנֶּפֶשׁ (Lev. xvii. 11): "in the nature or quality of the soul." On the Assyrian *ba-šu*, in him, *i.e.* he is, *vid.* Friedr. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 166.

[1] Probably the same word as the Armenian *sakr*, to which the (Italian) significations, *mannaja scure brando ferro*, are assigned in Ciakciak's Armenian Lexicon; cf. Lagarde's *Gesammelte Abh.*, 1866, p. 203.

shame). יִסֹּגוּ is *Niph.*: may they be made to retreat (cf. *e.g.* Isa. xlii. 17). On the figure in *v.* 5 *a* cf. lxxxiii. 14. The clauses regarding the angel of Jahve (*vv.* 5 *b*, 6 *b*) are circumstantial clauses, viz. adverbial clauses of manner. דֹּחֶה (giving, viz. them, the push that causes them to fall; equivalent to דֹּחָם or דֹּחֵם, lxviii. 28, the reading of the LXX., ה and ם being mistaken for one another; cf. שׁמאה and שׁמאם in 1 Chron. viii. 32, ix. 38, Prov. xx. 16) is connected with the figure in 6 *a*, רֹדְפָם with the figure in 6 *b*; it seems, therefore, that the original position of these two clauses regarding the angel of Jahve has been altered, just as in Ps. xxxiv. the ע-strophe and the פ-strophe have exchanged their original places. The angel is meant who struck off the wheels from Pharaoh's war-chariots, so that they dragged along heavily (Ex. xiv. 25). That this angel is interested here, where the question is, whether the kingdom of promise is to be destroyed or not at its very commencement, accords with the appearance of the מלאך ה׳ at seasons of fundamental importance in connection with the history of redemption. חֲלַקְלַקּוֹת, *loca passim lubrica*, is an intensive expression for חֲלָקוֹת (lxxiii. 18). Just as דֹּחֶה recalls Ex. xv., so רֹדְפָם recalls Judg. v.; there also the angel of Jahve, incarnated as it were in Deborah, appears in the midst of the victors who are pursuing the beaten foe. Just as in *v.* 5 *f.* the original position of דחה and רדפם is interchanged, so *v.* 7 also needs to be readjusted: שַׁחַת רִשְׁתָּם would be a pit provided with a net below, but covered above in order to escape notice; but even older critics have recognized that שׁחת should be transferred from 7 *a* to 7 *b*: without a cause, *i.e.* without any fault on my part, they have secretly laid their net for me (as in ix. 16, xxxi. 5), without a cause they have digged a pit for my soul (חנם חפרו שַׁחַת לנפשׁי). In *v.* 8 the enemies are looked at collectively. לֹא יֵדָע (with pausal *ā*) is a negative circumstantial clause (Ew., § 341 *b*): *improviso*, as in Prov. v. 6, Isa. xlvii. 11 *extr.* Instead of

תִּלְכְּדֵנוּ we have תִּלְכְּדוֹ: the sharper form of the suffix to the perfect (cf. Jos. ii. 4; Hos. viii. 3, Eccles. iv. 12) depicts better the suddenness and certainty of the capture. According to Hupfeld, the verb שָׁאָה signifies a wild, confused din or crash, then devastation and destruction, a change of meaning, which, as appears from שׁוֹאָה (cf. תֹּהוּ) as a name of the wild desert, from שָׁוְא, a waste, a vacuum, and from other indications, is effected without the intermediation of the notion of the crashing in of ruins, but simply by transferring the idea of a wild confusion of sounds to that of a wild confusion of things. It is questionable, however, if the signification, the waste, the desert, the void, is not rather the original one, and the reference to sounds the derived (cf. هَوَى, to gape, be empty; to vanish, fall down headlong, then also: to make a dull sound like something falling, in exactly the same manner as *rumor* from *ruere*, *fragor* from *frangi*), a view which is favoured both by etymology (cf. תָּהָה, whence תֹּהוּ) and by the predominance of the first signification. Here the two significations stand alongside of one another, the first שׁוֹאָה meaning the waste, *i.e.* devastation, the second, the waste, *i.e.* a low, heavy, dull sound (δουπεῖν). The Syriac translates, as if it were שַׁחַת the second time instead of שׁוֹאָה: "into the pit, which he has digged, may he fall." But this *quam ipse paravit* does not stand in the text.

Vers. 9, 10. This strophe, with which the first division of the Psalm closes, contains the logical apodosis of those imprecatory jussives. Triumphant joy will follow the overthrow of the power that is opposed to God. The bones of the body, which appear elsewhere as participating only in the anguish of the soul (vi. 3, xxxi. 11, xxxii. 3, li. 10), are here interested also (as in li. 10) in the joy, into which the anguish, which caused even the marrow of the bones to quake, passes over; the joy of the Ego is to throb through all the members of the body, and multiply itself, as it were, into a choir of

lauding voices. כל has a conjunctive accent and *Makkef*; it is written thus also in Prov. xix. 7 (*vid.* Baer's *Liber Psalmorum Hebraicus atque Latinus* on Ps. cxxxviii. 2, p. 158), and, according to Ben-Ascher, also in Ps. lxxxviii. 7 (כָּל, not כָּל); in such cases we must read, not *kâl* (with קמין רחב), as Kimchi and Norzi think, but *kŏl* (König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 455),[1] the *Mercha* (here, as also in Prov. xix. 7, the servile of *Legarmeh*, instead of *Mehuppach* which is usual elsewhere), as Lonzano rightly remarks, being equivalent to *Makkef*, and therefore having the same effect. The exclamation מִי כָמוֹךָ is taken from Ex. xv. 11, where, according to the Masora, it is to be punctuated מִי כָמוֹךָ, as Ben-Naftali also punctuates it in our passage: the *daghesh* which stands there, but is wanting here, at once sharpens and hardens, and demands an emphatic pronunciation of the expression. חָזָק מִמֶּנּוּ, stronger than he, equivalent to "strong, whereas the former is weak," like צַדִּיק מִמֶּנּוּ in Jer. xxxi. 11 (cf. Hab. i. 13): righteous, whereas the former is ungodly. The repetition of וְעָנִי implies: He delivers the עָנִי, who is over and above אֶבְיוֹן, from him that despoils him of his few possessions.

Vers. 11–16. The second division of the Psalm begins with two strophes giving a sorrowful description of the wickedness of his enemies. The imperfects in *vv.* 11 and 12 describe what is happening at present. עֵדֵי חָמָס are μάρτυρες ἄδικοι (LXX.). They demand of him an acknowledgment of deeds and things, which lie altogether outside of his consciousness and of his way of acting (cf. lxix. 5); they would fain brand him as a perjurer, a usurper of the throne, a freebooter. What David complains of in 12*a* we hear Saul acknowledging in 1 Sam. xxiv. 18; the reproach of ingratitude is therefore well grounded. שְׁכוֹל לְנַפְשִׁי is not dependent on יְשַׁלְּמוּנִי, in which case we should have expected כִּשְׁכוֹל

[1] In Assyrian sometimes *kullatu*, totality, from כלל, sometimes *kâlu*, all, each, the participle of כלה, corresponds to this Hebrew word.

(Targ. מִתְקַל) ; it is a noun clause: bereavement is to my soul; its condition is that of being forsaken by all who formerly showed love towards me; these are all as good as dead to me. Not only that David had been under the necessity of removing his parents for safety to Moab; but Michal also was torn from him, Jonathan was withdrawn, and all those at the court of Saul, who had hitherto sought the favour and friendship of the highly endowed and highly-honoured son-in-law of the king, were alienated from him. And how uprightly and sympathetically he had responded to their affection! With וַאֲנִי, *v.* 13, he contrasts himself with the ungrateful and the unsympathetic. Instead of לְבַשְּׁתִּי שָׂק we have here לְבוּשִׁי שָׂק; the tendency of poetry to use the noun-clause is closely connected with its love for elegant brevity and pictorial delineation. He manifested towards them a love which abolished the distinction between "I" and "thou," which looked upon their sorrow and their guilt as his own, and made expiation for it along with them; his head was sunk down deeply upon his breast, or he bowed down, like Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 42), upon the earth, with his head hanging down upon his breast even to his knees, so that the prayer which came forth from his inmost being returned in broken accents into his own bosom. Riehm's interpretation: "my prayer, however, came back without having effected its object," imports into *v.* 13 an antithesis, which is foreign to the line of thought commencing with וַאֲנִי and would lead us to expect אֲבָל (cf. Matt. x. 13, Luke x. 6) instead of אֶל־חֵיקִי. *Je priai*—Perret-Gentil renders it correctly—*la tête penchée sur la poitrine.* I went about, *v.* 14 goes on to say, as with a friend, a brother of mine, *i.e.* as if the sufferer were such an one. The rise from רֵעַ to אָח is the same as in Prov. xvii. 17. In *v.* 14 the original text probably ran: כרע כאח לי שַׁחְתִּי כאבל־אם קדר הִתְהַלָּכְתִּי; cf. xxxviii. 7 (Riehm). כְּאֵבֶל־אֵם, not: like the mourning (from אֵבֶל, like הֵבֶל from הָבֶל) of a mother (Hitz.); but seeing that a per-

sonal אֵבֶל is more naturally suggested in this connection, and next to the mourning for an only child, the loss of one's mother (cf. Gen. xxiv. 67) strikes the deepest wound: like one mourning (כְּאֵבֶל־, like לְבָךְ in Gen. xlix. 12, from אֵבֶל, construct like טְמֵא) for his mother (objective genitive, as in Gen. xxvii. 41, Deut. xxxiv. 8, Amos viii. 10, Jer. vi. 26). With שַׁחֹתִי, used of the deep bowing down of the body, in which the weight of sorrow expresses itself, there alternates הִתְהַלָּכְתִּי, which of itself expresses the solemn slowness of pace, which corresponds with the consecration of sorrow; קֹדֵר is added to this latter expression: mourning in hue, in mien, in attire, *i.e.* with dark clothes, with tearful unwashed face, with neglected beard. They, however—how do they bear themselves now, when he finds himself in צֶלַע (xxxviii. 18, Job xviii. 12), in a sideways direction, *i.e.* ready to fall (cf. צָלַע, ظلع, to incline to one side). They rejoice and gather together, and this company of ungrateful friends, who rejoice at another's misfortune, is still further augmented by the lowest rabble associating themselves with them. The verb נָכָה means to smite; *Niph.* נִכֶּה (Job xxx. 8), to be driven forth with whips, after which the LXX. renders it μάστιγες, Symm. πλῆκται, and the Targum, *conterentes me verbis suis;* cf. הִכָּה בַלָּשׁוֹן in Jer. xviii. 18. But נְכִים cannot by itself alone mean smiters with the tongue, cavillers. Along with רַגְלַיִם the adjective נָכֶה means elsewhere one who is smitten in the feet, *i.e.* one who limps or halts, and along with רוּחַ, and even without any addition (Isa. xvi. 7), one who is smitten in spirit, *i.e.* one in deep sorrow. Accordingly נְכִים, from נָכָה, just as נְאִים is from נָאָה, may also mean smitten men, *i.e.* men reduced in circumstances (Hengst.). After the Arabic نكى (نكأ), whence *munki*, slanderous and quarrelsome, or after نَوِكَ, to be injured in mind, whence *anwak*, stupid, silly, one might also understand it as meaning quarrelsome or frantic, mad people; but the former defini-

tion of the term is favoured by the continuation of the participial adjective נכים by means of וְלֹא יָדָעְתִּי, men of whom I had hitherto taken no notice, because they stood too remote from me, *i.e.* men belonging to the dregs of the people (cf. Job xix. 18, xxx. 1). Hupfeld translates: "smiting when I did not expect it"; but apart altogether from נכים, ידע does not mean "to expect," but "to know" (cf. Hos. viii. 4), and only one in the condition described in Prov. xxiii. 29 *ff.* could be smitten without knowing it. We understand וְלֹא יָדָעְתִּי after the analogy of xviii. 44, lxxxi. 6. It is equivalent to ואשר לא ידעתי, and naturally enough suggests the conjecture נָכְרִים (Olsh., Grätz); but if this conjecture is adopted, the expression becomes tautological; and it is by no means uncommon to find Psalm-poetry reaching out beyond the ordinary vocabulary in order to describe that which is detestable as glaringly as possible. Nor does קָרַע, to rend in pieces, viz. with slanderous words (like קרע ii.), occur anywhere else; but we must not on that account read קראו (Grätz, Dyserinck), which is too colourless. And how very strangely 16*a* now runs! מָעוֹג does not mean derision or a low kind of wit, as Böttcher and Hitzig assume,[1] but after 1 Kings xvii. 12, a cake of a round form (like the Talmudic עוּגָה, a circle); לָעַג means deriding, given to cracking jokes; לַעֲגֵי מָעוֹג therefore means: mockers for a cake, *i.e.* men who for a good morsel, for the sake of a savoury meal, make derisive jests, viz. about me, the persecuted one, low parasites, lick-spittles (the Greek κνισσοκόλακες, ψωμοκόλακες, the mediæval *buccellarii*). This לַעֲגֵי מָעוֹג, which Raschi already explains in substantially the same way, either stands in a logical co-ordinate relation to its *regens*, חַנְפֵי (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 19, Job xx. 17; *vid.* on Isa. xix. 11), in which case the meaning of the clause is: profane persons, viz. cake-witlings; or, and this is more natural and appropriate, the profane (*i.e.* the

[1] Also according to *Ochla veochla*, No. 59, מעוג has תרי לישנין (two different significations) here and in 1 Kings xvii. 12.

most profane; *vid.* xlv. 13, Isa. xxix. 19, Ezek. vii. 24) among cake-witlings. The בְּ is not the *Beth* of accompaniment or fellowship, instead of which עִם or אֵת (Hos. vii. 5) would have been used, but *Beth essentiæ* or the *Beth* of quality: in the quality or character of the most reprobate of this class of men they gnash upon him with their teeth. The gerundive חָרֹק (said of the grating sound caused by the teeth being pressed against one another, just as حرق is said of the crackling of a fire and the rasping of a file),[1] which is used according to Ges., § 131, 4 *b*, implies its subject in itself. They gnash their teeth upon him after the manner of the most profane among those, to whom their neighbour's honour is worth no more than a delicate morsel.

Vers. 17, 18. Just as the first division of the Psalm ended in longings and in thanksgiving for their fulfilment, so the second division also closes with supplication and thanksgiving. בַּמָּה (compounded of בְּ, *instar*, and the interrogative מָה, which is attracted by it into the genitive; Aramaic בְּמָא, Arabic *kam*, Hebrew, like בַּמָּה, with *Dag. forte conjunct.*, properly, the sum total of what?) usually means *quot*, here, however, as also in Job vii. 19, *quousque*. Hitzig also renders it: how long wilt Thou look on? In Job vii. 19, however, he denies to בַּמָּה this transition from *quantum* (*quot*) to *quamdiu*; but the two passages go together to confirm this meaning. מִשֹּׁאֵיהֶם, from שֹׁאָה, the plural of which may equally well be שֹׁאִים as שֹׁאוֹת (which, however, does not occur), just as the plural of אֵימָה, terror, is אֵימִים and אֵימוֹת. The suffix, which refers to his enemies as the authors of the destructions (Prov. iii. 25), shows that it is not to be rendered "from those that trouble them" (Hitz.). If God continues thus to look on instead of acting, the perturbations which are disquieting David's soul, will annihilate it. Hence the petition: lead it back, bring it back, recover the soul

[1] *Vid. Physiologie und Musik in ihrer Bed. für die Grammatik* (1868), p. 31.

that is already well-nigh borne away unto destruction. On יְחִידָה *vid.* xxii. 21. כְּפִירִים, which is meant literally in xxxiv. 11, is here emblematical. אוֹדְךָ is cohortative. עָצוּם as a parallel word to רַב always refers, according to the context, to strength of numbers or of power.

Vers. 19–21. In the third division (*vv.* 19–28), the description of the godlessness of his enemies is resumed; the soul of the suppliant, however, has become calmer, and accordingly the language also is more transparent and moves on in quite a customary way. שֶׁקֶר and חִנָּם are accusatival adverbial determinations (*vid.* Prov. xxiii. 29). The verb קרץ means both to pinch = nip (Job xxxiii. 6; cf. the Arabic *ḳaraḍa*, to cut off with a sword) and to pinch together = wink, usually said of the eyes, but also of the lips (Prov. xvi. 30), and always as a malicious gesture. As in lxxv. 6 and frequently, אל dominates both the parallel members. שָׁלוֹם (*v.* 20) is the term for everything that proceeds from good intentions and aims at the furtherance or restoration of a friendly relationship. רִגְעֵי־אֶרֶץ (from רָגַע, √רג, רך, whence *e.g. raǵana*, to keep quiet, *retiré;* cf. עַנְוֵי־אֶרֶץ, lxxvi. 10, Zeph. ii. 3, צְפוּנֶיךָ, lxxxiii. 4) are those who quietly and unobservedly walk in God's ways. אֶרֶץ with *Athnach* after *Olewejored* remains here (as also in Prov. xxx. 14) quite regularly unaltered (*vid.* on Prov. xxx. 21). Against such they devise mischievously false slanders and accusations, and with wide opened mouth, *i.e.* with haughty scorn, they cry, as they feast themselves with the sight of the misfortune of those persecuted by them: we have the very thing which we longed to see. הֶאָח (compounded of הֶ and אָח with ָ, just as in כָּחֹשִׁים, אֲחִי, הֶחְיִי) is an exclamation of joy, and more especially of the malignant joy that exults at another's misfortune (cf. Ezek. xxv. 3).

Vers. 22–24. The poet takes up this malicious "now our eye sees it," and gives a different turn to it. In *vv.* 22, 23 (cf. *v.* 17), אֲדֹנָי, the pronominal force of which seems to be revived in the combination אֱלֹהַי וַאדֹנָי (*vid.* xvi. 2), alternates

with ה. הֵעִיר, implying its object in itself, means to stir, to waken up, and הִקִּיץ, to break off, set one's self free, to gather one's self up, from sleep. "For my right," viz. to prove it by deeds; "for my cause," to plead it as my defender.

Vers. 25, 26. On the metonymic use of נֶפֶשׁ as τὸ ὀρεκτικόν instead of ὄρεξις, *vid. Psychologie*, p. 203. What they eagerly desire is to swallow up David, *i.e.* to get him in their power and to destroy him so that no trace of him remains: בְּלַעֲנוּהוּ with ע before נ, as in cxxxii. 6 and freq.; on the vocalic law bearing upon this, *vid.* Ew., § 60 *a*. שְׂמֵחֵי רָעָתִי, a short form of expression for שְׂמֵחִים עַל (בְּ) רָעָתִי, to be clothed with shame and disgrace (cix. 29; cf. *v.* 18), so that these cover them wholly and their public external appearance becomes like their inmost nature.

Vers. 27, 28. Those are said to have pleasure in David's righteousness, who desire that it may come to the light and be avenged. When this takes place, Jahve's righteousness is confirmed. As in Num. xiv. 17 and Mal. i. 5, יִגְדַּל is optative; but it is not used here in the same sense as in those passages: "may He show Himself to be great," but as in xl. 17, 2 Sam. vii. 26, and 1 Chron. xvii. 24: may He be recognized and praised as great, *i.e.* let Him be magnified. Instead of יֶחְפַּץ שְׁלוֹם עַבְדּוֹ, the conclusion is expressed in a more general way in lxx. 5, xl. 17. The words favour the לדוד of the title. David desires that all those who stand uprightly by him may speak thus with reference to him; he on his part is resolved to stir up the revelation of God's righteousness in his heart, and to allow that of which his heart is full to cross his lips (lxxi. 24).

Butler & Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London.

The Foreign Biblical Library.

EDITED BY THE REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.,
EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," ETC.

The Foreign Biblical Library is intended to provide prompt and accurate translations at a moderate price of the best and newest contributions of

Orthodox Foreign Scholarship to Biblical Study and Research.

While the series will mainly consist of Standard Commentaries in their latest editions, other works interesting to the Biblical student will be from time to time included.

Special pains will be taken, in the first place, to include no books but those of permanent value; and, in the second place, to provide accurate and scholarly translations of the latest editions of all volumes selected.

While the series will mainly consist of works hitherto untranslated, some earlier volumes will be translations of Biblical works represented in this country only by renderings from early editions now superseded. It is the habit of Foreign scholars to revise elaborately—and often almost to re-write—their Commentaries for new editions, and it is obvious that injustice is done both to authors and readers by continuing to reproduce the earlier form. As in all these cases the translations will be produced under the supervision of the author, each work will have the advantage of his latest corrections, and thus represents his present opinion even better than the original.

Arrangements have been made with the leading Scholars of the Continent for the prompt translation and publication of their principal forthcoming works; and the books in the following list are all in a forward state of preparation.

A new binding has been designed for the Series, which will be strong and substantial as well as elegant, and thus suitable for works that will be in constant use.

Each Volume of the Series will be issued in large crown 8vo, at the uniform price of 7s. 6d. per volume.

The Foreign Biblical Library.

I.

STILL HOURS. By RICHARD ROTHE. Translated by JANE T. STODDART. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A.

From a Review by DR. MARCUS DODS:—"It is a book of the first order, full of Rothe himself, and of which one wearies as little as of the face of a friend. It forces its way into our regard, and becomes our constant companion, refusing to be put on the shelf. It has something for every mood. It wins us with a ceaseless attraction to open it, and it never disappoints. We should not greatly pity the man on the desert island who had brought ashore a copy; nay, it would be a discipline of infallible efficacy for mind and spirit."

II.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. By Professor FRANZ DELITZSCH, of Leipzig. In three volumes. From the latest edition specially revised and corrected by the Author. Translated by the Rev. DAVID EATON, M.A.

The *Guardian* says:—"Of Prof. Delitzsch's new edition it may be fairly said that it is the most complete and trustworthy commentary on the Psalms which exists. Ten years have now elapsed since the last edition was published, and in the interval many important works have appeared, throwing new light on questions of Hebrew philology or otherwise bearing on the interpretation of the Psalms. All these are duly noticed by Prof. Delitzsch, and the results, as far as was possible or necessary, incorporated in the notes. It is the care which this veteran scholar uniformly bestows upon his successive editions that gives them their peculiar excellence. We trust that Prof. Delitzsch's commentary may long retain its well-deserved popularity."

III.

SELECTED SERMONS OF SCHLEIERMACHER. Translated by MARY F. WILSON.

The greatest sermons of one of the greatest of German preachers.

IV.

CHURCH HISTORY. By Professor KURTZ. Translated and edited from the latest edition by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., and specially revised by the Author.

DR. PHILIP SCHAFF says:—"It is a shame that the English translation of Kurtz, which was made from the second edition, is still sold and used as a text-book in Scotland and America, although the author has long since not only doubled its size, but so entirely reconstructed the whole as to make the older editions useless and mischievous. . . . THIS WORK HAS NOW THE MONOPOLY AMONG GERMAN STUDENTS."

V.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ISAIAH. By Professor FRANZ DELITZSCH. Translated by the Rev. JAMES DENNY, B.D. From the latest edition, and specially revised by the Author.

CANON T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., says:—"By far the most complete and equal commentary is that of Dr. Franz Delitzsch. He who will patiently read and digest the NEW EDITION of this masterly work will receive a training both for head and heart which he will never regret."

LONDON: HODDER AND STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.